DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 298 103 SP 030 516

AUTHOR Metz, Mary Haywood; And Others
TITLE Field Study on Teachers' Engagement Project on the Effects of the School as a Workplace on Teachers' Engagement--Phase One. Final Report.
INSTITUTION National Center on Effective Secondary Schools, Madison, WI.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Jun 88
GRANT G-00869007
NOTE 206p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC09 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS High Schools; *Institutional Characteristics; Role of Education; *Social Class; *Socioeconomic Influences; Student Behavior; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Behavior; *Teacher Role; Teacher Student Relationship; Teaching (Occupation); *Teaching Conditions

ABSTRACT

This collection of papers is the final product of a project designed to explore the ways in which high schools as organizations facilitate and frustrate teachers' ability to be engaged with their work. Ordinary schools were chosen as the research subjects: two in high socioeconomic (SES) settings; two in middle SES settings, and two in low SES settings. Two Catholic schools were included--one middle-class college-bound, and the other predominantly working class. The schools were considered alternately as social structures, technical systems, cultural systems, and political systems. Similarities and variations in teachers' approach to their work in the classroom were considered by looking at a triangle composed of teachers' roles and behavior, the students' roles and behavior, and the formal curriculum in use and the broader goals teachers pursued with students. Particular attention was paid to the multiple interacting differences that flow from communities and families in different social class situations into the schools. Social class was seen as having a pervasive and fundamental role in the internal lives of schools and teachers. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED298103

SP

FINAL REPORT

FIELD STUDY ON TEACHERS' ENGAGEMENT

PROJECT ON THE EFFECTS OF THE SCHOOL AS A WORKPLACE ON TEACHERS' ENGAGEMENT—PHASE ONE

NATIONAL CENTER ON EFFECTIVE SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Mary Haywood Metz, Principal Investigator

June 1988

The research on which this material is based was supported by The National Center On Effective Secondary Schools at the Wisconsin Center on Education Research which is supported by a grant from the Office of Educational Research and Improvement Grant #G-00869007. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions expressed in this paper are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, or the United States Department of Education.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SP 030 516

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION

II. "THE AMERICAN HIGH SCHOOL": UNIVERSAL DRAMA AMID DISPARATE EXPERIENCE"—Mary Haywood Metz

III. TEACHERS ULTIMATE DEPENDENCE ON THEIR STUDENTS: IMPLICATIONS FOR TEACHERS' RESPONSES TO STUDENT BODIES OF DIFFERING SOCIAL CLASS—Mary Haywood Metz

IV. "REAL" TEACHING: HOW HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS NEGOTIATE NATIONAL, COMMUNITY AND STUDENT PRESSURES WHEN THEY DEFINE THEIR WORK—Annette Hemmings

V. BELONGING AND WORK CONTROL IN TWO SUBURBAN PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOLS AND THEIR EFFECTS ON TEACHER ENGAGEMENT—Alexander K. Tyree, Jr.

VI. SOME MISSING ELEMENTS IN THE REFORM MOVEMENT—Mary Haywood Metz

VII. CONCLUSION

I. INTRODUCTION

FINAL REPORT

FIELD STUDY ON TEACHERS' ENGAGEMENT

PROJECT ON THE EFFECTS OF THE SCHOOL AS A WORKPLACE

ON TEACHERS' ENGAGEMENT—PHASE ONE

NATIONAL CENTER ON EFFECTIVE SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Mary Haywood Metz, Principal Investigator

INTRODUCTION

This collection of papers is the final product of the Field Study on Teachers' Engagement which was part of the National Center on Effective Secondary Schools' first phase of The Project on The Effects of the School as a Workplace on Teachers' Engagement. The papers were all written for separate symposia or collections and so they are each independent of one another—although the paper by Metz on "The American High School" and the papers by Hemmings and Tyree were presented together in a symposium at the annual meetings of The American Educational Research Association. There is inevitably some repetition and overlap among them, especially in presentation of the sample of schools and methods of data collection. Since each paper was written to stand separately, they also do not build cumulatively upon one another. In this introduction and in a conclusion I set forth some general commentary that will provide the reader with a context for the papers.

The project was designed to explore the ways in which high schools as organizations facilitate and frustrate teachers' ability to be engaged with their work. We chose ordinary schools without special innovative efforts on the premise that before one can engage in successful efforts to engineer change, one must have a thorough understanding of the interacting factors that shape the social settings one hopes to transform.

Since prior work in the sociology and anthropology of education (e.g. Anyon 1981; Bowles and Gintis, 1976; Connell, 1982; Heath, 1983; Lubeck, 1985; Weis, 1985; Wilcox, 1982) indicated social class differences in communities and student bodies affect the quality of life inside schools in pervasive ways, we took care to build social class variation into the sample of schools we studied. We studied eight schools. Six were public schools. Two were in high SES settings, two in middle SES settings, and two in low SES settings. We also included two Catholic schools in our sample; one served a predominantly middle class, college going clientele and the other a predominantly working class one. Details of the design are included in the following papers.

As we approached the schools looking for conditions that affect teachers' ability to be fully engaged with their work, we were guided not only by our interest in engagement, but by some broad theoretical orientations in the study of organizations that helped us to understand what we saw in the schools. We

considered schools alternately as social structures, technical systems, cultural systems, and political systems. The perspective of looking at organizations alternately as different kinds of systems is by now well established in the sociology of organizationns (e.g. Scott, 1981 and Zey-Ferrell and Aiken, 1981). The particular set of perspectives we used has also been used before to study schools (Firestone, 1980; Metz, 1986). We further looked at conditions affecting teachers' level of alienation and engagement on the job using literature on the conditions affecting alienation among workers in varied occupations (Blauner, 1964; Seeman, 1972, 1983). Finally, we considered similarities and variations in teachers' approach to their work in the classroom in each school by looking at a triangle composed, first, of the teachers' roles and behavior, second, the students' roles and behavior, and third the formal curriculum and curriculu in-use and the broader goals teachers pursued with students. We looked at this triangle through what teachers said to us in interviews and informal observations and through what we saw observing classrooms and sometimes in conversations with students. We used this theoretical framework to write up working vignettes of every school immediately after we left it, in order to capture its characteristics and their interaction while they were fresh in our minds.

This field study was purposely inductive. We did not intend to test hypotheses or to confirm or disconfirm already defined lines of analysis. We entered the field with some broad questions and a general theoretical framework within which we could think about the phenomena we saw. Beyond that we left ourselves open to what the schools could teach us. In such inductive work, observations in the field inevitably lead one to revise the way one understands concepts and theoretical linkages. Indeed the improvement of relevant schemata for organizing knowledge is one purpose of inductive work.

We realized prior to the study that community characteristics, and particularly social class, would have a significant impact on the life of the schools we studied. We did not entirely anticipate the magnitude of these effects, however. In trying to understand the effects of social class on the daily lives of teachers, we also came to appreciate the degree to which schools are open systems, a term used in organizational theory to point to the degree to which organizations must be thought of as continuous with their surroundings, rather than as separate, bounded, entities (Scott, 1981). Organizational theorists have recently been stressing the openess of many organizational systems that we have been accustomed to thinking of as closed, tightly bounded by the limits of their formal control and activity. Even business organizations, for example, are deeply affected by the actions of other businesses and governmental agencies, by the kinds of persons they hire, and by the customers they deal with on a regular basis.

Schools are designed in ways that make them more open systems than most organizations. The community has formal oversight over their practice through school boards and informal influence through parental interactions with their children and the staff. Students are the "raw material" the schools are supposed to mold, but, unlike inanimate objects, high school students come to school with wills of their own that are fundamentally affected by their experiences in the community and their understanding of their relationship to the larger society, as well as their understandings of the role high school will play in their anticipated life trajectories.

While these statements may seem obvious, once said, and while there is widespread recognition that the social class of communities and of students affects the work of school staffs, these facts are often ignored in writing about educational policy. Our methods did not allow us to ignore them. Because our methods involved participant observation for over two weeks in each school and involved us in eight schools in a single school year, we were exposed to the striking and deeply personally affecting differences in daily life in American high schools of differing social class in a way that few practitioners, policymakers, or researchers are. When one spends most of three consecutive weeks in a school, trying to learn as much as possible about it, then spends the next weeks reliving the experience in taking notes and summarizing the life of the school in a long descriptive vignette, one becomes personally immersed in the life of that school. To have this experience at either the high or the low end of the spectrum of social class in America, then move immediately to repeating the experience at the other end, is to feel intensely the multiple interacting differences that flow from communities and families in differing social class situations into the schools, and there play a significant part in reconstituting social class for the next generation. Since so much of policymakers', and even many researchers', discourse pays scant attention to the impact of social class on schools, it seems important that we try to convey its pervasive and fundamental role in the internal lives of schools in reporting on this research. All three of Metz's papers and Hemmings's paper, "Real School...." touch on these issues.

Our fieldwork also surprised us with the degree to which we found ourselves persistently lead to understand meaning, cultural dimensions, as primary in determining the impact of school settings on teachers. We did anticipate this finding to some extent. We chose an inductive approach in part because prior research had suggested that in schools participants' understandings must be captured in their own terms in order for a researcher to comprehend the important driving forces in the setting.

On reflection, it is not surprising that meaning or culture plays a stronger role in shaping the life of schools than it does in many other kinds of organizations. The passing on of knowledge and the building of character are their mission. Both of these goals involve persuading the young to share their elders' perspectives. In contrast, workers can build widgets while having quite varied thoughts and feelings. Indeed, even in business the importance of culture is being increasingly recognized (Deal and Kennedy, 1982; Peters and Waterman, 1982).

In schools, the work of teachers with their students consists in constant transactions around meaning. Students must not only perform physical activities such as moving through halls and writing. They must comprehend, remember, and integrate the material they learn and be able to employ it in novel contexts. As soon as one thinks about that fact alone, it becomes clear that not only meaning, but socially shared meaning, is crucial to the life of schools. Furthermore, it has also long been clear that schools have a less well-developed technology than do most organizations that make physical objects (Dreeben, 1973; Lortie, 1975). The lack of technical clarity increases the importance of meaning, or culture, in the life of the organization as the work process itself must constantly be reinvented to match circumstances, while its results are always subject to social or subjective

reinterpretation (Metz, 1978).

Even in teachers' relations with other adults, meaning was everywhere crucial. We found teachers in different schools who described waits of similar lengths for xeroxing of materials as one of the most serious detriments to their work and one of the best supports the school offered. Similarly, we found teachers whose siblings and friends were employed in jobs not requiring a college education saying that their pay was definitely adequate, while teachers, making more, whose siblings and friends were managers or lawyers felt underpaid, even "poor". Tyree set out to write his paper, "Belonging and Work Control in Two Suburban Public High Schools..." about the effects on teachers' level of engagement of structural conditions surrounding teachers' work, the degree to which they were involved in socially integrating groups and their control over the conditions of their work. In the end, he found himself arguing that the major differences between the two schools he looked at carefully turned on "normative integration", the meaning they gave to their joint actions, as it interacted with these structural conditions.

We also learned a good deal from the field about the nature of engagement. We realized even as we attempted to conceptualize engagement carefully that it is a transitive state. One is not simply more or less engaged, one is necessarily engaged with something. Consequently, we tried to understand what it was that teachers were engaged with at each school, what it was they were trying to do in their role as teachers, before we asked how engaged they were in doing it. We learned that in some settings the aims they would like to pursue do not fit the social context in which they find themselves, so that they are constantly frustrated. Both Hemmings's paper "Real Teaching..." and Metz's "Teachers' Ultimate Dependence..." analyze the working out of this process.

As we analyzed our data and wrote about the schools, we worked from the outside inwards. We looked at the effects of the overall character of each school, and of the differences and similarities between schools, on the working lives of their teachers. In starting with this perspective, the differences between the schools and the heavy impact of social class stood out. There was so much to write about here, that we did not get far beyond this layer of the analysis in preparing the papers for this report. Their emphasis on the larger context at each school should not be taken to mean that there were not subtler, less powerful, forces at work within the schools—including teachers' own individual and collective strategies—that modified the effects of community and students upon the teachers. There were. Furthermore, there were important differences between schools at the same class level that we have written about only fleetingly in these papers. These topics are also important and will be raised in further writing from this data.

This set of papers constitutes the formal final report of the Field Study and of this part of the first phase of the Project on The Effects of the School as a Workplace on Teachers' Engagement; its completion marks the end of the formal association of the authors of these papers with the Center. Nonetheless, these papers are not the final intellectual product of their work. Metz hopes to engage in considerable further analysis of this data. She currently has in draft a paper, "The Impact of Cultural Variation on High School Teaching" in which she discusses the effect on teachers' practice and on the overall character of the school of interaction among meanings generated by the community, the students, the

principal, teachers' individual backgrounds and current associations outside school, and teachers' collective perspectives. The paper analyzes the life of three schools—one high, one middle, and one low SES school—in these terms.

REFERENCES

Anyon, Jean. "Social Class and School Knowledge." Curriculum Inquiry 11 (1988): 3-42.

Blauner, Robert. Alienation and Freedom. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.

Bowles, Samuel, and Herbert Gintis. Schooling in Capitalist America: Educational Reform and the Contradictions of Economic Life. New York: Basic Books, 1976.

Connell, R. W. Making the Difference. Sydney: George Allen and Unwin, 1982.

Deal, Terrence and A.A. Kennedy. Corporate Culture. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1982.

Dreeben, Robert. "The School as a Workplace." In Second Handbook of Teaching edited by R. M. W. Travers, pp. 450-473. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1973..

Firestone , William. "Images of Schools and Patterns of Change." American Journal of Education 88 (Augustl980): 459-487.

Heath, Shirley Brice. Ways with Words: Language, Life and Work in Communities and Classrooms. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Lortie, Dan C. Schoolteacher: A Sociological Study. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Lubeck, Sally. Sandbox Society: Early Educatin in Black and White American—A Comparative Ethnography. Philadelphia: The Falmer Press, 1985.

Metz, Mary Haywood. Classrooms and Corridors: The Crisis of Authority in Desegregated Secondary Schools. Berkeley, Calif. University of California Press, 1978.

Metz, Mary Haywood. Different by Design: The Context and Character of Three Magnet Schools. New York: Routlege and Kegan Paul, 1986.

Peters, T. J. and Waterman, R.H. In Search of Excellence: Lessons from America's Best Run Companies. New York, Harper and Row, 1982.

Scott, W. Richard. Organizations: Rational, Natural and Open Systems. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1981.

Seeman, Melvin. "Alienation and Engagement." In The Human Meaning of Social Change, edited by Angus Campbell and Philip E. Converse. New York: Russell Sage, 1972.

Seeman, Melvin. "Alienation Motifs in Contemporary Theorizing: The Hidden Continuity of the Classic Themes." Social Psychology Quarterly 46 (1983):

171-184.

Weis, Lois. Between Two Worlds: Black Students in an Urban Community College. New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1985.

Wilcox, Kathleen. "Diffential Socialization in the Classroom: Implications for Equal Opportunity." In Doing the Ethnography of Schooling, edited by George Spindler. New York: Holt, 1982, pp. 102-131.

Zey-Ferrell, Mary and Michael Aiken. Complex Organizations: Critical Perspectives. Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman, 1981.

II. "'THE AMERICAN HIGH SCHOOL': UNIVERSAL DRAMA AMID DISPARATE EXPERIENCE"

Mary Haywood Metz

"THE AMERICAN HIGH SCHOOL": A UNIVERSAL DRAMA AMID DISPARATE EXPERIENCE

by

Mary Haywood Metz

National Center on Effective Secondary Schools

University of Wisconsin—Madison*

*The research on which this paper is based was supported by the National Center on Effective Secondary Schools at the Wisconsin Center on Education Research which is supported by a grant from the Office of Educational Research and Improvement Grant #G-00869007. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, or the United States Department of Education.

This is a revised version of a paper presented at the annual meetings of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, April 9, 1988.

"THE AMERICAN HIGH SCHOOL':

A UNIVERSAL DRAMA AMID DISPARATE EXPERIENCE

Mary Haywood Metz

National Center on Effective Secondary Schools

University of Wisconsin—Madison

Variations on the phrase "The American High School" adorn the titles of popular recent reports on reform (Boyer, 1983; Cusick, 1983; Powell et al., 1985; Sedlak et al., 1986; Sizer, 1984), expressing a common belief that they address a single institution. American high schools are indeed alike, strikingly so in many important respects. But they are also very different in other important respects. Reformers have paid little attention to these differences, indeed some ignore them while others mention them almost reluctantly, hurrying on to describe what is common among schools. Still, the differences among schools are crucial to their daily practice and to their effects upon students, and so to reform. This paper addresses the interplay of similarity and difference in American high schools, regarding their similarity, rather than their difference, as problematic and in need of explanation.

THE DATA

The paper arises out of a study of teachers' working lives undertaken at the National Center on Effective Secondary Schools. In that study we took a close look at a set of teachers in "ordinary" or typical high schools spread across the social class spectrum and including Catholic as well as public schools. We wanted to learn how these teachers understood the nature of the teaching task, and how the setting of the school, as a workplace, helped them or hindered them in doing that work. We were ultimately interested in the ways in which the school settings around teachers support or undercut their engagement in the process of teaching. Accordingly, the staff of the Center Project on the Effects of the School as a Workplace on Teachers' Engagement chose eight high schools to visit and study. We visited each school in teams, spending more than two weeks, and a total of about thirty person days in each school.[1]

We chose eight schools in midwestern metropolitan areas. Six were public schools and two were Catholic. Two were in high, two in middle, and two in low SES areas. One school, Quincy, was in a small industrial city, drawing mostly middle income students not bound for college, but with some diversity. (All of the names for the schools are pseudonyms.) One school, Charles Drew, was in a very poor, all black section of one of the ten largest cities, which we call The Metropolis. The rest of the schools were in and around one of the thirty largest cities in the country, which we call The City. Two, Maple Heights and Cherry Glen, were in suburbs where the population was highly educated and a large proportion held professional or managerial jobs. Pinehill was in a blue collar suburb, with a student body roughly like Quincy's. Ulysses S. Grant was in a

changing area of The City where income was low, though not as low as in the neighborhood surrounding Charles Drew in The Metropolis. The two Catholic schools were in the City. At St. Augustine's the student body was large and predominantly middle class, while at St. Theresa's it was small and predominantly working class.

We chose this range of schools because previous research in sociology and anthropology suggests that differences in the social class of communities and student bodies have serious implications for the life of schools (e.g. Anyon, 1981; Bowles and Gintis, 1976; Connell, 1982; Heath, 1983; Lubeck, 1985; Weis, 1985; Wilcox, 1982; Willis, 1977). My own work had explored aspects of the impact of students' social class and ethnic backgrounds on desegregated schools (Metz, 1978a, 1978b, 1978c; 1986).

While our fieldwork in each school was too brief to be genuinely ethnographic, the strength of the design lay in its comparative potential. We attended classes and interviewed teachers in situations that were formally parallel[2] across the eight diverse schools. We could see their differences in clear relief.

THE COMMON SCRIPT

We chose the sample of schools we did because we expected to find some important differences among them. Our visits to the first schools quickly gave us dramatic evidence that our expectations were correct; participation in the varied schools provided us radically different experiences. The buildings varied from resembling a college campus, at suburban Maple Heights, to resembling a fortress, at Charles Drew in The Metropolis. The use of time varied from intent and taut to relatively relaxed. Maple Heights allowed students to go home for lunch or to roam its spacious lawns in small groups after eating, while Grant and Drew kept all but the main door locked and security guards at Drew checked students' picture identifications both at the door to the school and at the entrance to the lunch room. More important, the content and tone of classroom discourse varied widely, as did the style of interactions between students and teachers.

This variation riveted our attention as we moved from school to school. But the discourse of the reform movement, which the Center as a whole hoped to address, as well as our emerging observations, especially at Drew, the school in the most depressed area, began to bring our attention around to what the schools shared, as well as how they differed. Analytically, it began to become clear to us that the reform movement was defining schools in terms of their formal structure and their technical procedures. And in these elements of school life the schools were indeed very alike. In terms of meaning, of culture, and of the place of the school in relation to the society and to children's life trajectories the schools were very different.

From the point of view of experience in the schools, of what we saw as we watched the schools in daily action, and talked with the actors who gave them life, it seemed that the schools were following a common script. The stages were roughly similar, though the scenery varied significantly. The roles were similarly defined and the outline of the plot was supposed to be the same. But the actors took great liberties with the play. They interpreted the motivations and purposes of the characters whose roles they took with striking variation. They changed

their entrances and exits. Sometimes, they left before the last act. The outlines of the plot took on changing significance with the actors' varied interpretation of their roles. Directors had limited control over their actors; only a few were able to get the actors to perform as an ensemble that would enact the director's conception of the play. Directors often had to make the best of the qualities the actors brought to their roles and to interpret the play consistently with the players' abilities and intentions.

Just the same the script was there, and the play was in some sense recognizable as the same play in all the schools. More important, the script was extremely important to some of the actors and some of the audiences. In fact, it was where the production was hardest to coordinate and perhaps least easily recognizable as the same play that was being produced at schools where action meshed more smoothly, that the school staffs were the most insistent that their production followed the script for "The American High School", varying from others only in details.

Let us consider, then, the features of the schools that were universal. All the buildings were built in the familiar "egg crate" design, with long halls off which opened rows of identical classrooms. The rooms were large enough for twenty to thirty-five students and were equipped with traditional chairs with writing arms arranged in rows facing a blackboard. School was in session for about seven hours, including a lunch hour. The day started early, in most cases before eight in the morning, and was divided into standard "hours", usually between forty and fifty minutes in length. Teachers taught five groups of students a traditionally defined subject; they met them for one hour a day, five days a week, at the same time and place for a semester or a year. One exception, Catholic St. Augustine's, used flexible scheduling, had renovated some rooms to provide larger spaces for "resource rooms", and defined teachers' loads by their total number of students. Even here though, teachers generally met a class of twenty to thirty three times a week, then met with students in smaller groups at other times and conferred with those who needed individual help during resource hours.

The scope and sequence that defined the outline of the formal curriculum varied little from school to school. The same subjects were offered, though the number of offerings in some departments, especially vocational education, was variable, as was the number of sections in subjects like foreign language and advanced science. The sequence of courses was also nearly universal, even in subjects like social studies and English where arguments could be made for quite varied sequences.

Textbooks were ubiquitous. With their aim at national markets, they do much to standardize the formal content of high school courses. We saw the same textbooks in use where students' scores on standardized tests were far below average and where they were concentrated well above the median. Instruction was conducted primarily through lecture, recitation, discussion, and seatwork, with occasional use of student reports, filmstrips, movies, and videotapes. The balance of these methods varied, however.

Students were expected to attend all their classes every day and to arrive promptly after a four or five minute period for movement between rooms. There were extracurricular activities after school, or occasionally during the last hour of

the day.

Teachers had undifferentiated roles. Department chairs held a slight measure of authority and engaged in some coordinating activities in exchange for one or two released classes, a little extra pay, or words of thanks from the principal. A few teachers were temporarily released from some portion of their teaching for a variety of special responsibilities, but these variations in routine were not permanent and conferred no formal special status, though they often brought informal prestige.

The formal structures of the school, whether temporal, spatial, or social looked very much alike. The scope and sequence of the formal curriculum, course names, and often course textbooks were similar or even identical across schools. Regarded formally, or seen from afar, or even in the paper that was collected in their varied central offices, the schools seemed to require similar routines from their staffs and to offer similar experiences to their students. The outlines of this description of schools' similarities are now familiar from the recent reform literature, which has described these similarities for broad audiences.

But, as I have already suggested, the appearance and style of the buildings, the strictness of enforcement of routines, and the relationships built among flesh and blood individuals on the staff and in the student body were variable. So was the curriculum actually in use. The content of classroom interactions, the questions asked on tests, students' written work, and the deportment of students in class varied widely.

Similarly, while all teachers wanted to imbue students with the cultural heritage and academic skills usually taught in high school, to prepare them to function capably in college or the workplace, and to round out their moral training, teachers working with different kinds of student bodies gave differing priorities to these goals and gave different substantive meaning to each. Hemmings's paper in this symposium explores variation and constancy in this area (Hemmings, 1988).

COMMUNITY AND STUDENT PRESSURES FOR DIFFERENCES AMONG SCHOOLS

There were several sources of differences among the schools. First, they were located in relatively homogeneous communities that differed from one another both in socioeconomic status and in subculture. In the suburbs with only one or two high schools and in the Catholic schools those communities had rather direct control over the schools through their governmental structures. The community and the parents of students were similar and broadly coterminous; the schools served real communities that were quite consistent in outlook and that had active networks of communication concerning school matters. Parents, former parents, and prospective parents for the particular school formed a large part of the electorate for the school board. The schools in larger communities had to deal with a central administration and electorate concerned with many schools and constituted of persons with varied experience and circumstances. These schools in the larger communities stood near the bottom of an informal pecking order among district schools, because they served poor, mostly minority students and

neighborhoods.[3]

Differences in the schools arose in part from cultural pressures exerted upon them by their communities. Despite attachment to the common script for high school education just described in all of the communities, there was considerable difference in parental and community interpretation of that script. Parents and community members exerted pressures on the schools to conform to their expectations. I have discussed these processes in depth as they were played out at one high, one middle, and one low SES school (Cherry Glen, Pinehill, and Charles Drew) in another paper (Metz, 1987). Differences in cultural expectations in part reflected the pressures of life in communities of radically different social class and the very different economic and occupational experiences of community members. These different experiences also directly affected students' academic, social, and personal resources and their own, their families', and their teachers' views of the futures in which they would put their school learning to use.

Despite these differences among communities and the differences they fostered among the schools, except for support for flexible scheduling at St. Augustine's, there was no evidence that any of the communities wanted or expected schools to depart from the basic common script for The American High School. This support may seem "natural" but in fact it requires explanation. Why should people with such different backgrounds and experiences and such different ambitions for their children all expect and demand "the same" high school education for them, even as they also produce pressures for interpretations of that "standard" education that produce important differences?

The persistence of the common script seems most problematic when one looks inside the school at teachers and students engaged in the common work demanded by the script. Except at the three schools with the most skilled, best-prepared students, with the most ambitions to go to college—Cherry Glen, Maple Heights, and St. Augustine's—large proportions of the students did poorly academically, including failing courses. At Drew, the school in the poorest neighborhood, the dropout rate was apparently over fifty percent and it approached fifty percent at Grant. Even at Quincy, it was substantial—though much lower, especially for white students. (None of the schools would give us exact figures on dropouts; so we had to piece together rates from such indicators as the difference in size of the freshmen and senior classes, or various estimates by teachers or counselors.) Even at Pinehill, where the dropout rate was not high, failing courses was common especially for freshmen. State regulations raising the credits required for graduation from eighteen to twenty-two were expected to threaten prospects for graduation for a noticeable proportion of students.

Furthermore, at all of these schools, students expressed alienation from the curriculum and from class and school procedures in various subtle or blatant ways. Students cut classes or cut school; at some schools there were chronic problems with severe tardiness. Once in class at these schools, students often carried on social conversations or read or wrote on unrelated projects, or sat limply staring, or put their heads down and slept. Some objected to assignments or quibbled with teachers over small issues; a few engaged in expressive interactions with peers designed for maximum disruption. In a few classes some students carried on a running guerrilla warfare, teasing and badgering teachers in various ways. In many

classes, especially at Pinehill, students had successfully negotiated with teachers for time in class to do "homework" that became an open social hour. The favored forms for expressing alienation from the schools' academic endeavors, and their severity and frequency, varied from school to school. Where schools were ability grouped, such expressive distance from, or disinterest in, the central tasks of the school was closely correlated with the ability level of the class. It was nearly absent in some of the more demanding classes at each of the schools and present in classes for students in academic difficulty at even the three schools where students were most skilled and ambitious.

TEACHERS' RESPONSES TO DIFFICULTIES WITH THE COMMON SCRIPT

Teachers' work, no matter how similarly structured, consists finally in transforming the minds and perhaps the characters of their students. To succeed in their work, they must at a bare minimum win the passive acquiescence of their students. Students' active cooperation will make the task far easier and the teachers' work more effective.

Consequently, students' expressions of distance and distaste for the academic undertaking created serious distress and frustration for teachers at these schools. A few who were determined and skilled individuals were able to reduce or mitigate these patterns through imagination and force of character within the parameters of the common script. Some, equally dedicated, tried hard but were unable to do so. Some of the teachers who tried hard to teach well in these schools experienced self-doubt and extreme frustration, which they voiced to us in very direct ways. Many other teachers gave indirect verbal and nonverbal voice to self-doubt that they could not or would not articulate directly.

Some teachers directed their frustration toward the students. They blamed the difficulty of teaching on the schools' students; they saw the students as intellectually or morally deficient. They wished they had students "like the old days" or they wished they taught in their idealized conception of a "better" school, a magnet school, a suburban school, or a school in a different kind of suburb where families cared more about education. Many teachers seemed to use such blame to protect their own imperiled sense of craft. While some teachers were more supportive of the students, those who still found it difficult to teach did not expect to tailor the institution or the learning to the students, but assumed that they must tailor the students to the institution.

Despite incontrovertible evidence that students were not learning well as these schools followed the common script, and despite the fact that both students and teachers were frustrated or alienated by the lack of connection between students and the expectations and activities embodied in the schools' structures and their formal curricula, teachers never suggested alternative strategies that would significantly change the common script. Nor did their communities press for such changes. (A few teachers did speculate about one or another possible change, but they did not seem fully to appreciate the systemic alterations their suggestions might imply.)

Although teachers did not ask whether there might be a mismatch between the school's formal curriculum or its routines and the students, that is between the

common script and the students, that might be remedied by fresh pedagogical or curricular approaches or uses of time and space, they did make informal adjustments in the script. Much of the difference between the schools in daily curriculum-in-use, in the sense of time, and in relationships resulted from adjustments in the common script that students and teachers created together through informal processes. Sometimes these were conscious adjustments on teachers' part in which they tried "to be realistic", as Quincy teachers put it, as they adjusted the curriculum without departing altogether from the formal curriculum embodied in the common script. Sometimes adjustments were gradual and formally unrecognized. For example, at some schools, teachers (and administrators) felt forced to put up with tardiness and truancy, as long as they stayed within reasonable limits, because they were too rampant to control. Some teachers simply sought strategies that would win students' attention to the lesson for at least for part of the class hour.

In short, teachers were forced to adjust to their students, to change school practices to accomodate students' unwillingness to meet certain demands (e.g. for significant homework) or abide by certain procedures (e.g. consistent prompt appearance in class). They did in fact change the system to meet the students. But they did not, for the most part, do it in formal ways and they did not attempt to challenge the common script. They did not argue for alternative pedagogical approaches, but "watered down" the common curriculum or made it "more practical" or just "did the best I can to cover the material". They did not alter expectations for prompt class attendance, but simply started getting the major business of the class going more and more slowly.

If one looks at students' learning simply as a technical problem, it is quite remarkable to see situations where a technical process (or the social structure which frames it) is clearly not effective on a massive scale, but no one in the organization thinks of trying alternative technical or structural approaches. Should a profitmaking company have such difficulties, it would soon be out of business unless it changed its procedures.

TEACHERS' PERSPECTIVES AS A REFLECTION OF SOCIETAL THOUGHT AND VALUES

This description could easily be read as an example of "teacher bashing", one more statement of the myopia of teachers, or their inability to think systemically or to bring about significant change. It would be a grave mistake to read it in this way. On the contrary, the teachers and schools' practices were common, and the teachers stood squarely in the mainstream of American educational thought in their reluctance to consider alternatives to the common script.

The low income and blue collar schools we saw resembled those reported on by many other investigators. There have been reports of low skills and high dropout rates in the central cities for more than twenty years. Recently, a number of reports have described student alienation and student-teacher negotiation of peaceful coexistence in return for minimal academic demands in solid blue collar and even middle class schools (Boyer, 1983; Cusick, 1983; McNeil, 1986; Powell et al., 1985; Sedlak et al, 1986; Sizer, 1984).

Furthermore, it would be naive to think that the adolescent students in these schools resist learning traditional material and complying with school routines simply because they find them culturally unfamiliar or the material lacking in intrinsic interest. The problem is considerably deeper than that and much of it is rooted outside the schools. John Ogbu (1978; 1987) has argued that minorities do not learn well because the economic experience of the adults they see around them has taught them that educational credentials do not yield the rewards for minorities that they do for majority students. They perceive a "job ceiling" that limits the rewards that can be gained from cooperation with the schools. Recently, he has noted that immigrant minorities who do not perceive these limitations and those for whom even low end American jobs constitute improvements over their experience in their home countries (1987) do better in school than do native minority students.

Both Ogbu and anthropologists who consider cultural differences between minorities and the mainstream schools to be minority students' most serious obstacle (e.g. Erickson, 1987), argue that minority students come to foster and exaggerate their cultural differences from the schools and from mainstream students in order to strengthen ingroup solidarity and establish a clear identity. In such a situation, students will resist the common script of high school because embracing it signifies betrayal of the peer group (Fordham and Ogbu, 1986) and of ethnic identity. Alterations in the script are unlikely to help to win their enthusiastic participation because their resistance is born of dynamics that transcend the school.

Similar problems exist in the apparently increasing resistance of blue collar white students to the schools and the common script. A number of external social processes have undercut the claims to authority of the schools and their individual staff members over the last twenty years (Hurn, 1985). Probably more important, as Sedlak and his colleagues (1986) argue, a high school diploma has decreasing value for young people hoping to use it as their major ticket to a place in the labor market. Children of blue collar and even lower white collar families have been watching the economic prospects of adults and older siblings in their communities contract during the last ten years. For these students, the most minimal cooperation with the school needed to obtain a diploma often seems a fair bargain for the minimal benefits bestowed by its receipt.

In short, only if one ignores important social processes shaping students' attitudes and behavior can one assume that alterations in the high school program to make the rhythm of the day less monotonous or the work more intrinsically interesting to students would have a major effect on their willingness to become engaged with schools' agendas. Students' alienation from schooling has significant roots outside the schools that teachers can do little about.

Nonetheless, in all of our schools there were some students making a visible effort to cooperate and do well. In all there were some teachers who were quite successful in drawing large parts of their classes into the academic enterprise, at least during class time.

While persons interested in education should never forget that teachers in an increasing proportion of schools must not just teach but must overcome outside

influences that corrode students' beliefs in the value of school learning, that insight does not indicate that schools and teachers are powerless or irrelevant. It does not make improvement of the schools a useless exercise. (It does perhaps suggest that the most dramatic improvements in teachers' and students' work together could be effected through change in the economic prospects of students headed for the lower two-thirds of the economy—but there is no sign that such changes are likely.)

Why, then, do teachers not think of altering the common script in order to tailor their education to their students' interests, experiences, or intellectual strengths? Why do they not press for a more flexible, adaptable, and less monotonous rhythm of activity? A large reason is that those around them, and, more important those organizationally above them do not. Teachers work within larger organizations that mandate much of the common script in non-negotiable terms. In most of our schools teachers had curriculum guides that outlined their formal curriculum, though they might be able to make a fairly broad range of choices within a given framework. The schedule of the school day was decided by the central district administration. State laws and Carnegie units for college admissions froze the larger outlines of the formal curriculum even beyond the district level. Architecture and union contracts shaped class size. In most cases district policy determined homogeneous or heterogeneous ability grouping. In other words, teachers were hemmed in by state laws, district directives, and college admissions pressures—as well as societal expectations—all of which presumed or required that they follow the common script.

There are historical roots to that script. Several historical works (e.g. Callahan, 1962; Katz, 1971; and Tyack, 1974) have traced the development of the forms we take as "natural" today. They stress the dominance of the factory model of organization at the time that compulsory schooling was being taken seriously, so that schools were increasing in number and public saliency, and being given what was to become their common form. Managers and bosses expected to have almost total control over subordinates. Schools were a mechanism for quick Americanization of diverse immigrants and efficient training of a labor force most of whom were headed for menial jobs where bosses and managers intended to be the brains while they were simply hands. Such a system was not designed to be responsive to individual or cultural diversity. If it failed to develop sophisticated literacy and numeracy in poorer children or those who were culturally different, then they simply would be channeled into work where sophisticated skills were not required or even desired. The common script, then, is in some ways a historical residue.

David Cohen (1987) has recently argued that the roots of the common script are deep in modern European history. He focuses on schools' attachment to teaching through a corpus of revered written works and through telling. He observers that innovations that are not consistent with these patterns are often introduced into the schools but soon wither and die. Western society learned to revere the few surviving written works of earlier great civilizations through the years of the middle ages when a few precious copies of these works were carefully preserved and laboriously copied. Protestant attachment to the Bible furthered this attitude. At the same time, he says, folk patterns of informal teaching in everyday life consist in telling, in instruction through didactic means. When the schools resist

innovations that would make children more active learners or adjust the curriculum to the child, they are only following deeply engrained cultural patterns of revering great books and of instruction by lecture.

This argument is intriguing and consistent with pervasive acceptance of the common script as an unexamined cultural assumption. Although Cohen does not make the point, it is important to note that these patterns are not continuous with the history and culture of many minority groups in United States, who come from oral traditions and who expect children to learn by watching adults and listening to discourse among them without much direct instruction. Many anthropologists have investigated the impact of cultural conjunction between white middle class students and the schools and cultural disjunction between minority students and the schools as an important source of poor minority school performance (Erickson, 1987).

Whatever its historical roots, the common script is embraced out of contemporary motives by a wide range of actors in the educational scene. Not only teachers, but (with some exceptions) district administrations, school boards, textbook manufacturers, and the education profession give scant attention to possible changes to the common script for high school, no matter how ineffective it seems to be in getting large categories of students to cooperate with school or to learn. Even the reform movement, despite talk of "restructuring" the high school, has not been seriously critical of the common script. The first wave of reform, exemplified in A Nation at Risk (National Commission on Excellence, 1983) and the increases in state and district initiatives for more testing and higher course requirements that have come in its wake, simply asks for tighter direction of the common script and for fuller documentation of outcomes.

The second wave of reform, exemplified in the report of the Carnegie Forum's Task Force on Teaching as a Profession (1986), is somewhat more critical of the common script. But it concentrates on restructuring teachers' roles—to make them more like professors' role—in order to attract more skilled people into teaching. Only a few voices (e.g. Sizer, 1984) propose changing the elements of the script which bear most directly upon students: temporal rhythms, use of space, formal curriculum, or grouping of students, except for the sake of relieving teachers from their current high levels of face-to-face contact with students. There are suggestions that teachers be given more power, and therefore the potentiality to change school structures and formal curriculum if they think it wise to do so. But, if what we saw is any indicator, teachers will find themselves working against considerable social opposition from the many groups who can affect their work if they try such changes.

Despite this reluctance to change the common script, to challenge its pedagogical assumptions, to question its traditional curricular content, or to look at the organizational structures and forms that support it, there does exist a countercurrent of educational theory and there have been opposing practices in schools—though more often in elementary than in high schools. This alternative tradition stretches back to aspects of the Progressive Movement and beyond (Cremin, 1961). It has been intermittently resurgent since then. This alternative tradition starts with the child and develops curriculum, pedagogy, and organizational forms around the perspectives (including subcultural perspectives), psychological development, or intellectual curiosity of the child. Still, it is not a simple

standing back to let the child unfold, as the teacher is always directing the child toward greater sophistication in literacy, numeracy, scientific understanding, verbal expression, civic awareness and so on. There have been many forms for such ideas.

Ethnic studies are one form, allowing minority children to study a history and literature with which they can feel some continuity as their entry point for the broader study of these fields. But ethnic studies had died out in the schools we saw; even Drew, with a one hundred percent black student body, had discontinued its last black studies class and had done very little to include black history or literature in the main curriculum. Many more localized and variable alterations of the curriculum—such as studying civics and government through local issues, or biology through locally available flora, fauna, and water, seem to have fallen almost completely not only out of favor but out of teachers' consciousness. They probably were never endorsed by more than an enthusiastic few in the sixties and seventies.

Some readers are probably asking what is remarkable here. Education is supposed to be about molding children. There is a societal tradition and cultural heritage to pass on. It is hardly surprising if public schools pass on the literature and history of dominant groups and a national, rather than locally based, curriculum. But the difficulty is that this curriculum is not being learned, even though it may be taught, except by the most skilled and ambitious students.

My intention here is to make remarkable a point of view that defines secondary education as providing traditional content, pedagogy, and organizational forms. This point of view assumes that if school staffs competently provide these, then children will learn, or, if they do not, then the students are themselves defective or blameworthy. That point of view is so common in American thought about education that it is almost never articulated directly, but simply assumed. Consequently, it is difficult for us to withdraw from it enough to consider its validity.

If the common script has not been able to produce good results with large proportions of students in recent years, it would seem reasonable to try altering the script. It requires explanation that neither teachers, nor educational professionals, nor policymakers, nor parent groups often consider such a possibility—despite the discouraging dropout and test statistics, teachers' common frustration, and daily school experience that shows the common script is failing to induce students to make academic progress. Why, then, is the common script so persistent?

THE COMMON SCRIPT AS "REAL SCHOOL":

A REASSURING RITUAL FOR PARTICIPANTS AND AUDIENCE

For all schools to follow the outline of the common script is rewarding to interested groups, regardless of how much students learn as a result, in two rather different ways. One way is satisfying to teachers and students as they participate together in the school, and to the parents who are their immediate audience. The other is satisfying to the larger societal audience from which the schools draw their legitimacy. In both cases the common script is serving symbolic, rather than technical, purposes. This idea may seem paradoxical when I have already said that the common script consists in the structural and technical, not the cultural, components of school life. But it seems to be the case that those structural and technical forms serve symbolic, cultural, purposes in the schools where they are not technically effective and students attend school without the hope or expectation of learning very much that will be practically useful to them either for itself or for its value as a credential. The presence of common forms across all public schools serves symbolic purposes for the public at large and for educational decisionmakers at state and national levels.

This analysis first came to us, as it deals with social patterns within individual schools, as we puzzled over the apparent contradictions of life at Charles Drew High School, the one of our schools serving the most deprived and depressed area. Charles Drew's neighborhood is desperately poor and has been all black for a quarter century. The neighborhood is considered dangerous for students to move through, at least after dark, and it is full of all the classic social ills associated with urban poverty. While we were there we heard about deviance in the area—gangs, drugs, robbery, and assault—and about poverty and its associated ills—welfare, early pregnancy, house fires, and constant residential mobility.

However, Charles Drew is not a typical urban school. It has a predominantly black faculty and a completely black administrative team. It has a large stable core among both teachers and administrators. There is both respect and connection between many members of this staff and the community. Despite residential mobility, families stay within the area. One assistant principal knew large proportions of the families and had taught many students' parents and knew or had even taught their grandparents. Teachers were expected to get to know the parents of their homeroom students and to establish a continuing relationship with them. Many teachers took this responsibility seriously and did develop collaborative relationships with these parents. Administrators and some teachers spoke of "the community" respectfully and with some knowledge.

The school had a core of administrators and teachers who were trying hard to make Charles Drew a viable high school that would assist its students to develop a solid academic background and to move on to steady jobs or to higher education. But Charles Drew struck us as deeply contradictory. It was in many ways far more relaxed than any of our other schools, especially in the sense of time. Even though, by district decree, there were more periods in a day than in our other schools, so that each period was only forty minutes long, students trickled in through the first five to ten minutes of class. A few were up to twenty minutes

late. Despite the presence of supervising teachers and security guards, there was a constant flow of traffic in the halls. Students skipped classes as well as coming late. The principal declared an amnesty day for truant students while we were visiting the school near Thanksgiving. Supposedly students who had been systematically skipping a class could return without penalty.

These patterns were adjustments the school made to its student body. With a dropout rate of around fifty percent, one of the school's main problems was trying to keep students from severing ties completely. Administrators insisted that teachers accept tardy students in their classes, lest tardy students who missed class fall so far behind that they ceased to come at all. Similarly, they asked teachers to give a second chance to students who had given up on a class if they would return under the amnesty provision.

The school also adjusted to students' low skills. Many teachers spent at least part of their time instructing students in skills and material that were far more basic than those the title of a course would suggest—although they also presented material that did indeed fit the traditional high school course labels. Teachers varied in the mix of their compromise. Most teachers seemed to present some material on the level of the course title and some that was remedial. Sometimes these adjustments consisted in class meetings that reflected titles, but written work that was simpler.

On the other hand, the formal curriculum of the school went to the other extreme. The principal had raised course requirements above district minima, despite having a student body nearly sixty percent of whom had reading and mathematics scores in the bottom quartile on the Iowa Test of achievement national scales in the sophomore year. Students had to take four years of English, four of mathematics, four of science and three of social studies to graduate. Furthermore, there were no easy electives to fill out these requirements. For example, students progressed from freshmen English through American literature to English literature and then to a senior class in composition and world literature. In that senior class they read, among other works, Huxley's Brave New World and Dante's Inferno. In science they moved from general science, to biology, to chemistry, to physics. As a consequence of these requirements, the school's vocational education program shriveled and nearly disappeared.

These contradictions were bridged by allowing students to progress to physics after taking, but not necessarily passing, biology and chemistry and without a requirement that they pass geometry and advanced algebra. The physics teachers taught fundamental measurement skills, and one said that she hoped to complete mechanics with students having a solid grasp of it by the end of the year but might get no further. Teachers at other schools told me they would complete mechanics before Christmas. In senior English, we saw students practising and struggling with the elementary forms and skills of a business letter, even though they would be reading Dante's Inferno later. The test on Brave New World in that course consisted of multiple choice questions that ensured students knew basic events and definitions of terms in the book.

The school also struggled to overcome severe social problems, so that one has to describe it in terms that stress, "on the one hand....on the other hand". Even

though there were many graffiti in the halls and even some classrooms and in the one bathroom that was not kept locked, they were regularly washed off and painted over. There were gang symbols included among the graffiti, but every one seemed to agree that the gangs did not operate inside the school. There was a grave courtesy in the way the vast majority of teachers spoke not only to but about students, even on the part of those teachers who, careful listening suggested, did not like or respect students. We saw only two cases of severe teacher-student conflict in over two weeks in the school for the teacher study.[4] (The administrators who followed assistant principals, who are crisis managers, saw at least the student side of more.) Every one seemed to agree that the halls and parking lot were safe, though occasionally a pair of students would become riled with each other in the halls, with a possibility for spectator involvement. The members of the administrative study team found administrators and security guards seemed able to get to such scenes quickly and to defuse trouble effectively.

In short, the school's life was shot through with disjunction and contradiction. A formal curriculum as demanding as that in our highest SES schools, including texts and primary readings that were just as difficult, was contradicted by student skills and written work that were infinitely weaker. In junior and senior classes serving the half of the students who would not drop out, there was also more discussion than was common in the other low and middle SES schools. Some students seemed to us to perform well, though some teachers cut off or failed to build on what we thought were perceptive comments. But students' written work did not come near to matching this oral performance. There was a similar disjunction between the formal standard requirements for use of time and space and the casual sense of time and large numbers of students moving about the school outside classrooms during class hours.

We came away from this school with a sense that the staff were putting enormous energy into creating a situation where every one could go through the actions that indicated that they were teachers and students in a real high school. It was here that we began to see the dramaturgical qualities of high school life. We felt that we were witnessing a play. The title was "Real School". Though there was tremendous social energy invested in the production, its contradictions gave it a fictional quality. It became clear that the participants were the audience as much as were we, or parents, or central office supervisors. There was nothing cynical about this production—though some teachers, played their parts lackadaisically or with ironic distance.

In the stressed circumstances that this school faced, dealing with a student body most of whom did not have academic skills adequate for high school work, and most of whom were distracted by turmoil in the community and their families, it became important to create a social drama that assured all participants that they were teaching and learning in a Real School. They also needed socially viable signs that they were Real Teachers and Real Students.

This insight also helped us to see how to reconcile differences between accounts of minority families whose patterns of communication are very different from those in school (e.g. Heath 1983) and accounts of minority preschool teachers whose behavior is almost a caricature of traditional elementary teaching (e.g. Lubeck, 1985) and of parents who insist on teaching school skills in traditional school style

very early (Joffe, 1977) or who look askance at child-centered instructional methods or even long recesses (Ogbu, 1974). Whether it is consistent with home patterns or not, Real School appears to be the way out of the ghetto; apparently it is highly valued and little questioned by poor parents who want a better life for their children.

Most of the minority teachers at the three schools where we encountered them responded the same way; they were staunch defenders of highly traditional patterns of teaching and placed a high value on strategies likely to yield good scores on standardized tests. At the same time, they could leaven their own teaching with cultural understandings they shared with students. At Drew especially, we more than once saw a black teacher bring a whole classroom to attention with a raised eyebrow and a look that clearly conveyed volumes to the students.

It is helpful in understanding what was happening at Drew to think of Real School as a ritual, rich with symbols of participation in cultured society and in access to opportunity. Teaching Dante, Huxley and physical mechanics to every graduating senior assured both teachers and students that they were participating in a high school that was worthy of the appellation. By making sure that every graduating senior had a rigorous academic course on his or her transcript, Drew's administrators made a statement that Charles Drew offered as good an education as the best suburb, and that its graduates were fit to compete with graduates of such institutions. Participating in the classroom actions that were part of this ritual, discussing novels by Steinbeck or the principles of the Englightenment, assured teachers as well as students that they were doing Real Teaching and Real Learning. Participation itself engaged them both in actions that assured them that this was really a school and that it was a Real School—thus making them Real Teachers and Real Students.[5]

As Nancy Lesko (1986) has pointed out in discussing rituals in a Catholic school, ritual has a chance through the medium of participation, which is less linear than discourse, to heal contradiction.[6] Charles Drew's many problems made it difficult for it to run a standard high school program without incurring a host of contradictions. By emphasizing school practices redolent with the symbolism of the best academic schooling, by instituting higher graduation requirements than the system expected, Charles Drew set high sights for both its students and its teachers and reassured them that despite their daily struggles to teach and to have a hope that high school could benefit them as students, the school was offering as genuine an education as that in the best suburban schools. Participation in the daily rhythms of a school, even if raggedly performed, handling and discussing difficult books, even if not writing about them in complex ways, reassured teachers and students that they were keeping up and gave them feelings of participating in a common drama played out in similar classrooms throughout the metropolitan area and the country.

The lessons that were so vivid at Drew seem transferable to the less dramatic productions at the other low income school and to the two blue collar schools where teachers doggedly maintained the patterns of Real School despite various adjustments to deal with their students' alienation. By following through with the ritual of Real School, teachers could feel they had taught, whether or not students learned. It seemed that it was at Drew and at Ulyssess S. Grant, the other low

income school, that the symbols and ritual of Real School were most underscored. It was at these schools that the status of the school and its teachers and students as Real was most in doubt, and therefore needed the most reaffirmation.

At Grant the affirmation that it was a Real School took quite a different form from that at Drew, however. Hemmings's paper (1988) in this symposium explores the Grant teachers' definitions of their work in some depth. Suffice it to say here that the mostly white faculty of Grant, who had seen the school change to a majority black school with a progressively poorer, more depressed, less skilled student body, tried to preserve their sense that they were running a Real School by "maintaining standards". That meant assigning some difficult work, but it especially meant giving low grades if students did not come up to teachers' ideas of a national standard of performance. The failure rate at Grant was very high. When the principal, under orders from the central office to do something about it, published a list of the grade point averages by teacher, it was teachers with the highest, rather than the lowest, grade point averages who told us the list had led them to think they might be out of line and should adjust their grading practices. We also heard teachers criticizing and dismissing other teachers as lacking integrity because they thought those teachers gave too high grades. By demanding work from students that "maintained standards" teachers could thus show that they, at least, were Real Teachers, even if most students were not Real Students.

At Drew most teachers affirmed their own status as Real, along with that of the school, by setting difficult but traditional tasks for which students were not adequately prepared. At Grant many teachers who remembered a different student body saw most of the current students as irremediably lacking in the qualifications to become Real Students and so bolstered their own status as Real Teachers, by, as they saw it, having the courage to proclaim their negative judgments of the students.

REAL SCHOOL AS A SYMBOL OF EQUITY

Although the symbols and ritual activities of Real School were most noticeable in the schools where strong education was most difficult to accomplish, they were present in all of our schools. The symbols and ritual are there not only for the immediate community, but also for a regional, state, and national audience. After all, as I noted before, much of the common script that teachers follow is mandated from outside and above. It is important to a wider audience than parents or an immediate community, that all schools follow a common template and can be said to be offering the same, commonly understood and commonly valued, high school education.

Why should it be important to people in the state capitol that all schools be essentially alike? Why should citizens committees, often composed of suburban residents, in both The Metropolis and The City, have been investigating and pressuring the urban schools? Of course employers want well educated candidates for employment. But the rhetoric of the citizens' commissions in both cities and of the national reform movement as well suggests a concern for the opportunities available to students to develop their potential and for equity, through offering

every new citizen a quality education.

Equality of opportunity, mostly through education, is a central tenet of our social and economic system. If it is to be reflected in reality, schools must indeed offer an equal education. The common script for schools as it is written into state laws and district directives and adopted by educators in encouraging a common formal curriculum, can be seen as an attempt to offer all students an equal education. But the process at work here bears some scrutiny. As the common script is enacted in the schools with an emphasis upon assuring equality through standardization, it becomes translated into the symbols and rituals that constitute Real School. Just as the rituals of Real School create more reassurance than substance in the daily life of some schools, so do they in the regional and national life of the society.

The study schools served communities that differed widely in privilege and power but in following the common script the schools were similar in most formal respects: in social structure, in the use of time and space, in grouping of students and even in the formal curriculum. But they were very different in one formal respect. They had very different distributions of grades, and when students took nationally standardized tests, the schools had very different profiles.

Schools not only teach the young the content of the curriculum and some of the social graces required to be a member in good standing of a school community. They also sort young people into groups labeled as barely employable, possessing moderate skill, capable of much further development, or showing extreme promise. The public schools rank the students who emerge from their doors after thirteen years in ways which are fateful for those young people's work, their economic fortunes, and their status among other members of society.

Imagine what would happen if, with the class of 1992 that enters high school next fall, the goal that educators and reformers seek were actually accomplished, so that all students became top performers. All of them would score in the 99th percentile on standardized tests (unless these were hurriedly renormed) and make perfect scores on the Scholastic Aptitude Test, not to mention having perfect A records throughout their schooling. Chaos would ensue. Colleges would not have room for all, but would have little ground on which to accept some and reject others. Employers looking for secretaries, retail salespersons, waiters, bus drivers, and factory workers would have jobs unfilled as every student considered such work beneath his or her accomplishments.

As long as education is used to rank young people and sort them into occupational futures that differ substantially in the money, status, power and intrinsic rewards they can yield, good education, or students' success at education, must remain a scarce commodity. Those who do succeed have less competition for access to attractive occupations, if large numbers of others do not. Those families who have enough power or wealth to do so have strong motivation to try to provide a superior education to their children, in order to give them an advantage in competition. They also have strong motivation to keep access to such a superior education limited, so that their children will face less challenge from others.

In the United States we say we do not believe in passing privilege from parent to child, however. We expect individuals to earn the favored slots in society through talent and hard work. The schools have been given the task of judging that talent and diligence. Consequently it is important to our national sense of a social system that is fairly ordered that all children have an equal opportunity through education. If we are to say that success in education is a fair and just criterion by which to award each child a slot in an adult occupational hierarchy based upon individual merit, then the poorest child must have access to as good an education as the richest.

How, then, to guarantee an equal education? By guaranteeing the same education. State legislatures and large school districts standardize in the name of equity. The reform movement speaks of high schools as all alike, because it is important to our political sense of fairness that they be all alike. The reform reports with their bland references to "the American high school" reflect a strong public consensus on the importance of offering a standard high school experience to all American children. The common script and its enactment with symbols and rituals of Real School in all high schools gives a skeletal reality to the claim of equity through sameness.

Nonetheless, there is unspoken public knowledge of the operation of an opposing principle. In practice, the public perceives schools to be actually very unequal. Middle class parents will make considerable sacrifices to locate their children in schools perceived to be superior. Communities of parents with the economic and political means to do so will construct superior schools for their own children and will keep access to them exclusive.

Separate suburban school districts facilitate residents' ability to create superior schools based on selected peers and superior resources. Ordinances requiring certain sizes for lots, or only single occupancy housing, can keep out lower income families. Fair Housing groups across the country document the continued practice of racial steering by real estate agents; it can be used to keep many suburban communities all or mostly white. These districts also can take advantage of their higher tax base to add the amenities of higher salaries for teachers, small class sizes, and richer stores of materials to their "standard" schools.

The six public schools we studied, although chosen to be ordinary, and although not including any really elite schools, provide eloquent testimony to the differences in public education that economic and racial housing segregation create in this country. In the communities they served, students received very different amounts of economic and educational resources from their parents and enjoyed very different levels of community safety and support. The schools reflected in their architecture, the nonteaching duties of expected of their faculties, their extracurricular activities, and their supplies the different levels of funding available from local tax bases. Not only parents and students but school staff entertained very different visions of students' futures; these visions shaped the relationships of staff and students and the curricula-in-use (see Hemmings 1988). Class differences in the communities played the largest part in creating the vivid cultural differences between schools I referred to at the beginning of this paper. After even two to three weeks of participation in each of these schools, it is clear that far more is hidden than revealed when one speaks in a single phrase of "The American High

School". Other papers from the study describe these differences (Hemmings, 1988; Metz, 1988, in preparation).

As a political entity, Americans seem to live with this contradiction between officially equal education based on the common script for the drama of Real School, on the one hand, and, on the other, tremendous variety in the quality and content of education arising from the linkage of public education to local funding and to housing that is segregated by social class as well as race. We rarely see, let alone openly acknowledge, the contradiction between these two principles. Political scientist Murray Edelman (1977) argues that simultaneous acceptance of such contradictory perspectives is a common feature in our political life.

Society's blindness to this contradiction serves the interests of the well-educated middle class. Children in schools with better prepared peers, which are attractive to better prepared teachers, have a considerable advantage in competition with the other products of America's standard and equal public schools. But middle class leaders feel no inconsistency in claiming that the young are rewarded according to merit even while they take care to place their individual children in contexts that foster merit much more actively than those to which other children find themselves consigned.

The formal regulations and informal expectations that create the common script for high schools, and that lead school staffs to use that script to create some form of a Real School, reinforce the apparent equity of American education. The common script for a Real School thus becomes a guarantor of equity across schools. It has important symbolic value in this way to an outside audience of citizens and educational policymakers, as well as to participants. Thus not only the staffs and parents of Drew and of Grant want to be reassured that these are Real Schools. So also do district administrators, state legislators, and leading citizens with an interest in educational equity—apparent or real.

CONCLUSION

There are no simple solutions to the problems and dilemmas our study uncovered connected to Real School. We did not seek this line of analysis or design the study to support policy proposals. We started out to explore the nature of teachers' working lives and to find out what about those working lives supported or inhibited their ability to be engaged with their work. In asking those questions, we could not help being struck with teachers' and schools' persistence in technical approaches that seemed to be failing to engage students' efforts or to improve their skills. These observations led us to ask why teachers did not desert the common script to try alternatives, or why they did not at least bemoan the larger organizational constraints that would have made it difficult for them to do so as they spoke with us in interviews. We also could not help being struck by the disjunction between the similar formal curricula and school structures and the markedly varied curricula-in-use and relationships in the schools that we visited. These differences in schools did represent some adjustments that teachers made to accomodate student (and community) differences. But these differences were often of a kind that seemed to have little to do with a serious attempt to improve students'

learning.

Our attempt to understand teachers' behaviors has led to the analysis I present here. Both state and district directives and mainstream culture press on teachers not to adjust their teaching to match students' interests or skills but to teach a single formal curriculum. Teachers are caught up in a societal belief that Real School consists in transferring a fixed and rather limited body of knowledge to students and in developing a fixed set of skills at a certain level. There are some fairly narrowly defined routines that are expected to be effective in this endeavor; if they are not, teachers are led to look for explanation to defects in the actors present in the school, especially themselves and the students.

The common script for structure and technical routines takes on deep cultural value. The enacting of Real School becomes an assurance of societal equity and participants' worthiness as much or more than a means for teaching children to master geometry and chemistry or grammar and clear writing technique. It is more symbolism and ritual than a set of technical means to the end of increasing students' skills and knowledge. This symbolic and ritual aspect of the common script is only easily visible in the schools where the script is least effective technically however. The script is not irrelevant to its technical ends. It works with reasonable technical effectiveness in schools where students come to high school with strong literacy, numeracy, and writing skills and a rudimentary knowledge of history and science. Its effective operation also depends upon realistic hopes of at least modestly successful economic futures to give students extrinsic motivation to compete with each other and to accept whatever agenda the school staff sets before them. These conditions apply in a decreasing number of schools, in only two of the six public schools we visited, and only three of the total eight. In our study, they applied where the majority of students expected to attend colleges with admissions standards that would eliminate some high school graduates.

The policy implications of these findings and analysis are considerably less than obvious. I have implied that we were puzzled that teachers, schools, districts, and educational systems do not try some alternative patterns in the face of the massive alienation and academic failure of a large proportion of the young people of the society. Even some of the experiments that were being tried in the sixties and seventies, to at least some anecdotal evidence of success, have apparently all but shriveled and died before the compelling symbolic power of Real School.

Still, there is evidence that it is not simply powerful administrators, policymakers, or civic leaders who support Real School and are inhospitable to changes. The strong embrace in which the predominantly black staff at Drew held Real School was probably not unusual for members of a minority community. The effective schools movement, which seems to have strong minority community support, has all the clear definition and traditionalism of Real School at the high school level, imposed upon young children. Even the students who skip classes or refuse to do the written work when they come, may accept only the most traditional activities of Real School as authentic. James Herndon's (1967) description of his experience of teaching poor black children in junior high school in the late fifties gives vivid evidence of this attitude. He describes how the children celebrated when a substitute teacher gave them grade level books, which

they embraced, but never worked in. They wanted the books; so they could not-do them, as Herndon says. In our terms, the books gave them symbolic status as Real Students, but were not something they wanted to involve themselves in learning.

Furthermore, there is some technical wisdom in the reluctance of administrators and parents to open the flood gates of experimentation. Standard curricular materials cut down the amount of work that teachers must do to present students a lesson that has at least minimal substance. Experimentation with genuinely alternative educational processes in an attempt to elicit students' intrinsic interest requires much more work from teachers. Many, perhaps most teachers, are likely to find the rewards from teaching unequal to the efforts such teaching requires. A good deal of skill and imagination is probably also required to succeed in such efforts, and not all teachers possess these requisites. Curriculum guides and texts support the efforts of the less than gifted.

It should also be noted that teachers' dependence on students has effects upon the level of effort and skill that many bring to the job. We noticed that students' demands in the schools with the most ambitious and skilled teachers produced pressures on teachers to do their best work. These teachers also talked about students who kept them on their toes. Similarly, we found that where students sought to turn classes into social occasions, many teachers also relaxed into such a mode. And where students were chronically tardy, at Drew, a minority of teachers, at least, had become equally casual about getting to class on time. The rituals of Real School, from the time schedule to the formal curriculum with its ubiquitous text books (that have accompanying teachers' manuals often including tests and suggestions or even scripts for conducting classes) place a floor under the teachers most likely to give in to students' apparent lack of interest in learning. They make it difficult for teachers to withdraw from teaching altogether, something that would be more likely were individual experimentation given carte blanche. Poor and minority parents who have been exposed to the low end of American schooling, are well aware of such possibilities; they have experienced some of them in action despite the protections of the common script. They are probably not wrong in seeing some guarantee and insurance of education for their children in the patterns and rituals of Real School.

Persons who are in a position to influence district, state, and national agendas for education are usually persons who were reasonably successful in learning through the patterns of Real School themselves. If an education through Real School has served them well and helped them to reach positions of leadership, it is understandable that they will generally see it as a reasonable pattern for education for all students. I am not suggesting a concerted conspiracy in the inability of the middle class to perceive the contradiction between their belief in equality in American education and their care to put their own children in protected superior schools. Few of us concentrate as much upon arrangements for social justice as upon those for the welfare of our own children. Most ordinary citizens and state legislators and a surprising number of educational administrators and policymakers have had little or no firsthand experience with schools for blue collar, let alone really poor or minority, children. If their images of what happens inside them are not clear and their diagnoses for them not well-suited to their realities, no one should be surprised.

If my analysis in the body of this paper is correct, then its policy implications are probably moot, because the political forces that support Real School are virtually indomitable. It may be deeply ironic, but a coalition of dispossessed students and parents, together with their teachers, see in Real School, a chance to maintain their pride and their sense of membership in the mainstream of American education, and so in American society. At the same time, the relatively privileged educational decisionmakers who determine the content of Real School can support offering it to all students and even intensifying its requirements for all without fear that they will increase competition for the children of more educationally privileged parents like themselves. Real School makes so little contact with poor students' experience—or for that matter even blue collar students' experience—that it is unlikely to spur more than a few of them to competitive heights of actual learning. Consequently, intensifying its efficiency cannot threaten the advantages of privileged children. Meanwhile, offering the same education to all appears to be the essence of fairness, unless one has a sense of the interactive processes that create the cultural life of schools within which learning occurs.

ENDNOTES

1. We visited the schools with two person teams for the teacher study. In a coordinated, but separate study Richard Rossmiller and Jeffrey Jacobson worked with administrators in the same schools. I have counted their eight days in the schools in our total. As principal investigator for the teacher study, I took the lead role in fieldwork at six of the eight schools. Nancy Lesko, a staff researcher at the National Center on Effective Secondary Schools, took the lead role in two of the eight schools. Graduate assistants, Annette Hemmings and Alexander K. Tyree, Jr., alternated as the second team member; at two schools both were present, sharing the second role.

2. In each of the eight schools we studied, we met with the principal and collected a set of documents about the school ranging from student tests scores to faculty and student handbooks and the master schedule for teachers. We then visited the classes of six students, half underclassmen and half upperclassmen, with one high, one middle, and one low achiever in each group of three. We thus saw a range of classes, at the outset, and got to know a varied group of teachers. We then spent a full day with each of eight teachers of core academic subjects, chosen to constitute a sample diverse in age, gender, race, experience, and philosophy. We interviewed these teachers at length after observing them. We used a standard, but open-ended, interview guide. We also conducted shorter interviews with ten other teachers in each school, chosen because they had special perspectives as chairs, union leaders, new teachers, and teachers in special education and vocational education. We chose some of the teachers for shorter interviews because of positions of informal leadership or because they seemed to have special points of view. At each school, then, we have notes on observation of classes and on informal conversations with teachers, as well as eight long, standardized interviews with teachers, and ten shorter, less formal interviews. There is a total of sixty-four long and eighty short interviews with teachers.

At the same time, the team for the administrative study was interviewing and spending days with administrators, head counselors, and chairs in the same schools. While the studies were coordinated, and data shared, Professor Rossmiller will write separately about findings from the administrative study. After visiting each school, we met for long sessions to share our data with the whole project staff. The two-person team who had visited the school for the teacher study then wrote a working vignette describing the school's operation as an organization and detailing teachers' immediate work environment. Following the theoretical frame with which we oriented the study, these vignettes were written looking at the schools alternately as structural and technical, as cultural and as political systems. They also used a framework from the alienation literature relevant to engagement to consider how and whether teachers work was situated in a larger social context of meaning, how teachers were or were not able to control their working environment, and the kind and degree of social integration available in the working context. The vignettes closed with a discussion of commonalities among all teachers, or subgroups of teachers, in the way they defined the knowledge to be learned and the proper roles of teachers and of students.

3. Two of the schools, Quincy and Ulysses S. Grant, were part of systemwide desegregation plans. Both drew most of their students from certain neighborhoods, but their tie to neighborhoods was more tenuous and they were relatively more diverse in student body than the other schools.

4. Incivility, insults intended to assault pride, is one of the major corrosive influences frequently at work in schools serving economically poor, poorly achieving children. Teachers can be as hurtful to students as students can be to teachers. Locked in what both feel to be a demeaning situation, they sometimes take their anger and self-doubt out on each other in verbally destructive ways that do not show up in statistics. But I saw much higher rates of such behavior in much less depressed schools in my earlier studies, especially at Hamilton (Metz 1978b) and at Fillmore (Metz, 1978c), than we saw at Drew.

5. Last summer after I had coined the term Real School and its implications for Real Teachers and Real Students, I was startled to attention one morning in my car by radio review of the movie Summer School. The plot concerns a physical education teacher asked to teach remedial English for the summer. A clip from the movie came on, and the physical education teacher demurred only to be told by the administrator asking him to take the job that the students were a disreputable and unskilled lot. So, said the administrator, you don't have to worry if you aren't a "real teacher, because they're not real students". (The terms real teacher and real student were used, but the rest of the sentence is constructed from a perhaps uncertain memory with my apologies to the makers of the movie.) The scriptwriter had chosen the same terms we had to convey the polarity of legitimacy and illegitimacy that surrounds the self-doubts and social denigration to which students and teachers are exposed in schools generally considered below par.

6. There is a rich literature on ritual in anthropology. I do not pretend expertise in this literature, which the reader can find reviewed in the first chapter of McLaren (1986), but I think I have captured at least a part of its general thrust in the text. The image—if separated from the layman's use of ritual as a dead and useless practice—gives the reader a more vivid sense of the workings of Real School as we experienced them in the schools where most students were not college-bound.

REFERENCES

Anyon, Jean. "Social Class and School Knowledge." Curriculum Inquiry 11 (1988): 3-42.

Bowles, Samuel, and Herbert Gintis. Schooling in Capitalist America: Educational Reform and the Contradictions of Economic Life. New York: Basic Books, 1976.

Boyer, Ernest L. High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America. New York: Harper and Row, 1983.

Callahan, Raymond E. Education and the Cult of Efficiency. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.

Cohen, David. "Educatonal Technology, Policy, and Practice." Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis 9 (Summer 1987): 153-170.

Connell, R. W. Making the Difference. Sydney: George Allen and Unwin, 1982.

Cusick, Philip A. The Egalitarian Ideal and the American High School. New York: Longman, 1983.

Erickson, Frederick. "Transformation and School Success: The Politics and Culture of Educational Achievement." Anthropology and Education Quarterly 18, no. 4 (1987): 335-356.

Fordham, Signithia, and John U. Ogbu. "Black Students: School Success: Coping with the Burden of Acting White." Urban Review 18 (Number 3, 1986): 176-206.

Heath, Shirley Brice. Ways with Words: Language, Life and Work in Communities and Classrooms. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Hemmings, Annette. "Real Teaching: How High School Teachers Negotiate National, Community, and Student Pressures When They Define Their Work." Paper presented to the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA: April 1988.

Herndon, James. The Way It Spozed to Be New York: Bantam Books, 1969.

Hurn, Christopher. "Changes in Authority Relationships in Schools: 1960-1980." In Research in Sociology of Education and Socialization, vol. 5, edited by Alan Kerckhoff. Greenwich, Conn.: JAI Press, 1985.

Joffe, Carole. Friendly Intruders: Child Care Professionals and Family Life. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1977.

Katz, Michael B. Class, Bureaucracy, and Schools: The Illusion of Educational Change in America. New York: Praeger, 1971.

Lesko, Nancy. "Individualism and Community: Ritual Discourse in a Parochial High

School" Anthropology and Education Quarterly 17 (March 1986): 25-39.

Lubeck, Sally. Sandbox Society: Early Educatin in Black and White American—A Comparative Ethnography. Philadelphia: The Falmer Press, 1985.

McLaren, Peter. Schooling as a Ritual Performance: Towards a Political Economy of Educational Symbols and Gestures. New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1986.

McNeil, Linda. Contradictions of Control. New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1986.

Metz, Mary Haywood. "Clashes in the Classroom: The Importance of Norms for Authority." Education and Urban Society 11, no. 1 (1978): 13-47. (a)

Metz, Mary Haywood. Classrooms and Corridors: The Crisis of Authority in Desegregated Secondary Schools. Berkeley, Calif. University of California Press, 1978. (b)

Metz, Mary Haywood. "Order in the Secondary School: Some Strategies for Control and Their Consequences.] Sociological Inquiry 48 (No. 1, 1978): 56-69. (c)

Metz, Mary Haywood. Different By Design: The Context and Character of Three Magnet Schools. New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1986.

Metz, Mary Haywood. "The Impact of Cultural Variation on High School Teaching." (In preparation)

Metz, Mary Haywood. "Teachers' Ultimate Dependence on Their Students: Implications for Teachers' Responses to Student Bodies of Differing Social Class." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA: April 1988.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. A Nation At Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office, 1983.

Ogbu, John U. The Next Generation: An Ethnography of Education in an Urban Neighborhood. New York: Academic Press, 1974.

Ogbu, John U. Minority Education and Caste: The American System in Cross-cultural Perspective. New York: Academic Press, 1978.

Ogbu, John. "Variability in Minority School Performance: A Problem in Search of an Explanation." Anthropology and Education Quarterly 18, no. 4 (1987): 312-334.

Powell, Arthur, Eleanor Farrar, and David Cohen. Shopping Mall High School. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1985.

Sedlak, Michael, Christopher W. Wheeler, Diana C. Pullin, and Philip A. Cusick. Selling Students Short: Classroom Bargains and Academic Reform in the American High School. New York: Teachers College Press, 1986.

Sizer, Theodore R. Horace's Compromise: The Dilemma of the American High School. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1984.

Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century. New York: Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy,. 1986.

Tyack, David B. The One Best System: A History of American Education. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1974.

Weis, Lois. Between Two Worlds: Black Students in an Urban Community College. New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1985.

Wilcox, Kathleen. "Diffential Socialization in the Classroom: Implications for Equal Opportunity." In Doing the Ethnography of Schooling, edited by George Spindler. New York: Holt, 1982, pp. 102-131.

Willis, Paul. Learning to Labour: How Working Class Kids Get Working Class Jobs. Westmead, England: Gower, 1977.

III. "TEACHERS ULTIMATE DEPENDENCE ON THEIR STUDENTS: IMPLICATIONS FOR TEACHERS' RESPONSES TO STUDENT BODIES OF DIFFERING SOCIAL CLASS"

Mary Haywood Metz

TEACHERS' ULTIMATE DEPENDENCE ON THEIR STUDENTS: IMPLICATIONS FOR TEACHERS' RESPONSES TO STUDENT BODIES OF DIFFERING SOCIAL CLASS

Mary Haywood Metz

National Center on Effective Secondary Schools

and Department of Educational Policy Studies

University of Wisconsin—Madison*

*The research on which this paper is based was supported by the National Center on Effective Secondary Schools at the Wisconsin Center on Education Research which is supported by a grant from the Office of Educational Research and Improvement Grant #G-00869007. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, or the United States Department of Education.

This is a revised version of a paper presented at the annual meetings of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, April 9, 1988.

"TEACHERS' ULTIMATE DEPENDENCE ON THEIR STUDENTS: IMPLICATIONS FOR TEACHERS' RESPONSES TO STUDENT BODIES OF DIFFERING SOCIAL CLASS"

Mary Haywood Metz

National Center on Effective Secondary Schools

and Department of Educational Policy Studies

University of Wisconsin—Madison

Recently both policy analysts and social scientists have paid a good deal of attention to stresses built into teachers' roles. Much of this literature emphasizes teachers' low status in the eyes of society and their lack of control over their working conditions (e.g. Ashton and Webb, 1986; Goodlad, 1984; Task Force on Teaching as a Profession, 1986). There has also been a good deal of attention to the uncertainty of teachers' work, stemming from the lack of a broadly and reliably effective technology and from the difficulty of judging long term effects on students (Ashton and Webb, 1986; Lortie, 1975). This uncertainty is intensified because teachers work in isolation. Not only do they work in physical separation, but often they keep silent about details of their practice out of fear that colleagues' knowledge of their best individual techniques could lose them an advantage in an implicit competition for high regard among colleagues and parents or, alternatively, out of fear that knowledge of their practice could lead to collegial condemnation of their skills. Such condemnation is the more unnerving because it is seldom voiced to a teacher's face; consequently most teachers are left uncertain what judgments are made of them by their colleagues (Ashton and Webb, 1986).

Analysts also repeatedly find that teachers' stress the intrinsic rewards of their work (Ashton and Webb, 1986; Biklen, 1983; Jackson, 1986; Lortie, 1975). Sometimes this stress upon intrinsic rewards is seen as a structural necessity because there are few extrinsic or auxilliary rewards that can be sought or increased. There is little promotion, while pay increments are generally automatically keyed to seniority. Summer vacations are given from the beginning, not earned. Therefore, all that teachers can control are intrinsic rewards (Lortie, 1975). The thrust of the current reform movement's proposals is toward increasing rewards for teachers other than those intrinsic to their classroom work, through career ladders or merit pay and through collegial support networks. Some reforms also would limit teachers' face to face contact with students (e.g. Task Force on Teaching as a Profession, 1986).

Analysts and policymakers' disquiet with the intrinsic rewards of teaching as a base for teachers' commitment to their work, arises in part from the difficulty of assessing the success that provides those rewards. It may not be clear to a teacher how much reward he or she deserves, that is how good a job he or she has

done. Furthermore, the signs of success given by the students may be very ambiguous. Conseqently, not only are the rewards available to the individual uncertain and unreliably related to the "actual" quality of performance, but intrinsic rewards are also a less than effective social tool for control of the quality of performance. It is relatively easy for some teachers to define reality in such a way as to create intrinsic rewards for themselves out of whole cloth in a defensive way, while others may have self-doubts or high standards that prevent them from reaping rewards to which relatively effective performance should make them entitled.

Dependence on intrinsic rewards is also undercut and rendered uncertain by the lack of a reliable technology or technologies for craftsmanlike accomplishment of the work. More fundamentally, teachers can not obtain the satisfaction of a job well done through their own efforts alone, they can obtain them only through the cooperation of their students—the very students they are supposed to discipline, lead, transform, or even reform. To rely upon intrinsic rewards in teaching, is to build one's house upon shifting sands.

It is extremely significant and too rarely noted that teachers are inherently dependent on their students for the successful practice of their craft. Since the results of teaching reside in the minds and characters of the students, the students have ultimate control over the fruit of teachers' labors. Consequently, teachers who depend upon intrinsic rewards to make their work worthwhile are extremely vulnerable to their students; the students can confirm or destroy such teachers' sense of pride in craft. At the same time, because it is teachers' responsibility to guide and change their students and students' responsibility to obey and follow their teachers, such vulnerability is paradoxical and not socially acceptable.

Both as adults relating to children and as professionals relating to clients, teachers are socially expected to be in control and in charge. To be dependent on clients who are children for the accomplishment of one's own success is both technologically paradoxical and socially demeaning. But in teaching—or any other kind of work where professionals try to change the inner states of people of lower status than themselves—it is inescapable. One can demand behavioral conformity through power alone, but to transform another person, one must have that person's assent and cooperation. As long as that person has any independence of mind and will, the professional is dependent upon his or her assent. Anyone who has had close contact with a child of eighteen months or older, knows that, while children are socially subordinate to adults, they have a sufficiency of such independence to make teachers' vulnerability a crucial existential reality.

Despite this inherent relationship, students may have so many reasons to cooperate with teachers that an observer would never notice teachers' dependence upon the students. In many circumstances, even teachers may be able to dismiss it from consciousness. Such willing and reliable cooperation from students can stem from several sources. The social legitimacy of teachers' leadership may be so pervasive that a student senses that noncooperation would bring the anger of many significant others down upon him or her. A form of this legitimacy particularly common in childhood inheres in many young people's innocent inability to imagine the viability of a disobedient, defiant, or indifferent posture in a relationship with an adult outside their family who is in a position of legitimate authority. More

pragmatically, high school students may be consistently cooperative with teachers because they exert control over rewards students are eager to seek.

The rewards and punishments attendant upon students' cooperation with their teachers are neither constant nor randomly distributed among the population. At the high school level, especially, they are closely related to the social class of the child. Since American schools are heavily segregated according to social class as well as race, whole student bodies differ radically in the rewards they anticipate from cooperating with teachers. Collective attitudes and expectations reenforce individual ones. In consequence, teachers' vulnerability in the face of their students' interpretation of the role school and its teachers play in their lives varies widely according to the social class of school populations. The effects of social class variation in schools on teachers' experiences in those schools have been too little studied.

This paper is based upon data from a year long study of high school teachers in eight "ordinary" high schools that differ in social class. It first explores teachers' feelings and attitudes related to the vulnerability created by their dependence on students. It then looks at how that dependence had quite different practical consequences for teachers who worked in settings where the social class of the students differed.

THE DATA

The research for this paper was part of the work of the National Center on Effective Secondary Schools. As part of its project on The Effects of the School as a Workplace on Teachers' Engagement, for which I was principal investigator, we observed, interacted with, and formally interviewed a set of teachers in high schools spread across the social class spectrum. We wanted to learn how these teachers understood the nature of the teaching task, and how the setting of the school helped them or hindered them in doing their work. We were ultimately interested in the ways in which the school settings around teachers support or undercut their engagement in the process of teaching.

Accordingly, I chose eight "ordinary" high schools, that is schools that did not have major innovations related to teachers' work, to visit and study. We visited each school in teams, spending more than two weeks, and a total of about thirty person days in each school.[1] All the schools were in midwestern metropolitan areas. Six were public schools and two were Catholic. Of the six public schools, two were in high, two in middle, and two in low SES areas. One school, Quincy, was in a small industrial city, drawing mostly middle income students not bound for college, but with some diversity. (All of the names for the schools are pseudonyms.) One school, Charles Drew, was in a very poor, all black section of one of the ten largest cities, which we call The Metropolis. The rest of the schools were in and around one of the thirty largest cities in the country, which we call The City. Two, Maple Heights and Cherry Glen, were in suburbs where the population was highly educated and a large proportion held professional or managerial jobs. Pinehill was in a blue collar suburb, with a student body roughly like Quincy's. Ulysses S. Grant was in a changing area of The City where income

was low, though not as low as in the neighborhood surrounding Charles Drew in The Metropolis. The two Catholic schools were in the City. At St. Augustine's, the student body was large and predominantly middle class, while at St. Theresa's, it was small and predominantly working class.

In each of the eight schools we studied, we met with the principal and collected a set of documents about the school ranging from student tests scores to faculty and student handbooks and the master schedule for teachers. We then visited the classes of six students, half underclassmen and half upperclassmen, with one high, one middle, and one low achiever in each group of three. We thus saw a range of classes, at the outset, and got to know a varied group of teachers. We then spent a full day with each of eight teachers of core academic subjects, chosen to constitute a sample diverse in age, gender, race, experience, and philosophy. We interviewed these teachers at length after observing them. We used a standard, but open-ended, interview guide. We also conducted shorter interviews with ten other teachers in each school, chosen because they had special perspectives as chairs, union leaders, informal faculty leaders, new teachers, and teachers in special education and vocational education. At each school, then, we have notes on observation of classes and on informal conversations with teachers, as well as eight long, standardized interviews with teachers, and ten shorter, less formal interviews. There is a total of sixty-four long and eighty short interviews with teachers, for a total of one hundred forty-four teacher interviews.

While our fieldwork in each school was too brief to be genuinely ethnographic, the strength of the design lay in its comparative potential. We attended classes and interviewed teachers in situations that were formally parallel across the eight diverse schools.[2] We could see their differences in clear relief.

It is probable that there are biases in our sample. All the schools are in two midwestern states, states where high school curriculum and evaluation is relatively lightly regulated by the state. Because these were midwestern states, most students are in public or parochial schools. No school served a really elite clientele, approaching the upper class, even though Cherry Glen is well up among the ten highest income school districts in its state. It serves three separately incorporated communities, of which one, Glen Hollow, is a genuinely wealthy enclave. Charles Drew comes closer to the opposite extreme. It was in a really poor, racially isolated area.

While we tried to find a large and a small school in each of our four categories, there was rather little variation in size among the schools. None of the schools were larger than two thousand students. Only two were smaller than one thousand: suburban Maple Heights with about seven hundred fifty, and tiny St. Theresa's with about two hundred fifty students.

Four schools refused our request for permission to study them. They were evenly spread across our categories—one high, one middle, one low income public school, and one blue collar Catholic School. The eight schools that did give us permission to visit seemed to us to be schools where principals felt fairly secure. Perhaps only such principals would give permission for three weeks of visits by a team from a place with the imposing title, "The National Center on Effective Secondary Schools." It takes some security to find such visits more challenging than

intimidating. In comparison to middle schools I had studied in earlier work where my own profile was much lower, I found relations between principals and teachers better than average in these schools—although there were still some significant tensions in this relationship in some of the schools. The reader should assume, nonetheless, that these were schools where principals were relatively confident. They thought their schools would not be hurt by outsiders taking a fairly close look at classroom practice and by outsiders listening to teachers whom they selected themselves.

There was also some bias in our selection of teachers to observe for a day and interview. We made a conscious decision, since we were studying conditions affecting teachers' engagement, not to study teachers who seemed to us to be incompetent, after seeing their classes when following students' schedules. We reasoned that a teacher who can not handle the subject matter or the demands of classroom management is facing such strong alienating influences, that other factors affecting engagement would be overwhelmed. We tried not to exclude teachers who seemed discontent or in some way alienated from our sample, but since alienation can lead to incompetence, as well as the reverse, we doubtless undersampled alienated teachers. Furthermore, individual teachers had the freedom to refuse to be observed and interviewed and some of our candidates for alienated respondents did turn us down.

Our sample thus is biased toward teachers who feel relatively productive and take a positive attitude toward their school environments. It certainly is in no way proportionally representative of teachers across the country. Its ability to inform us about teachers in general lies in the lessons we learned about how processes in the school and the classroom can affect teachers' personal responses to their work. We can not speak to the frequency with which the varied processes that we saw occur. We can illuminate the nature of social processes surrounding teachers' work and show the coherence of certain social patterns.

THE PERSONAL IMPACT ON TEACHERS OF DEPENDENCE ON STUDENTS

As we talked with teachers, the abstractions of the uncertainty of teaching and of the lack of a reliably effective technology appeared in the form of human experience, often of poignantly painful human experience. I used two portraits to convey that pain in an opening for an article for an educational newsletter for practitioners and policymakers in which I painted the scene surrounding the quotations in more vivid colors than is usually appropriate in a scholarly paper[5]:

> **A pretty young teacher from a European country, is teaching for a year in the comfortable midwestern suburb of Maple Heights, where over three quarters of the students will go to college, many to prestigious ones. She perches uneasily on her chair to be questioned by an American researcher. Asked where it is easier to teach, she**

hesitates and says a comparison is hard to make. "I have wonderful things here", she says, "many more facilities. The gym is much nicer. I have a tape recorder, and a filmstrip machine in my own classroom [for foreign language instruction]. I have access to a videotape player any time I want it. But I have been disappointed to find the students are just as lazy here. They come to class already tired. The first year students especially want to know if we are going to do something fun today. Fun, always fun they want. I find this puzzling because I am a serious person and I expect some seriousness from them."

Asked whether teachers in her home country encourage their children to be teachers, she becomes reflective. "No, I think not," she says, "because the job is never ending.... You are never finished, never have a weekend to yourself." Her voice grows quiet and contemplative and she gradually starts speaking almost to herself as she says, "You are never at peace, always questioning yourself about whether you did something right. Asking whether there is a better way. Whether the teaching you have done is really good quality. You never know whether you have done a good job or not. You question yourself all the time." She shakes her head as she considers such a job for her child, who does not yet exist, and says softly "No, I wouldn't".

On another day, not far away, in a poor neighborhood of The City, for which Maple Heights serves as a bedroom community, at Ulysses S. Grant High School a seasoned social studies teacher talks to the same researcher, who is visiting his classes. He is eager to tell about the plans he has developed to get complex concepts across to his freshman and junior students in upcoming days. Despite his careful planning, as she watches classes the researcher finds to be thoughtfully presented, interesting, and even absorbing from her own perspective, students sit passively. The teacher says that, often, as he gets well started on a lesson he has planned with thought and care he watches students' heads subside on their desks, one by one. On other days, some classes become restless and he can barely keep order. In answer to the questions of her interview he says:

You've got to have a relationship where you're fair and they can trust you. And [they] can have some success. They feel they're getting some progress here, therefore the guy must know what he's doing...

[They have to trust you to have control,] that somebody isn't going to walk over you, that kind of thing. So in the first hour [this morning, when I said to that student] 'Time out. Get out of here!', I hope they could see that we're getting at something worthy here.

This isn't just Mickey Mouse... I think that generates trust rather than 'This guy's a phoney; we're not doing anything here.' A trust that comes from a person who's serious.

You've got to get into your subject, you've got to get impassioned about it. And that's sometimes where I lose my temper. When somebody goofs off, I just can't stand that. I called a kid a shithead once. 'Get out of here. I don't want to see you,' and so forth 'Jesus Christ...'and so forth. And I was quite sincere. And so I think that builds up a regard, an ethical appeal that you've got to have."

Later, asked to compare his work to that of relatives and friends, Mr. Voight says that in business, "there's more recognition. Teachers have a need for some. Nobody knows what they're doing. And that's a struggle. "Do I amount to anything?' You can't tell me a lot of us don't go through that once in a while.... Outside, in business and so forth, perhaps there's more chance to achieve some specific thing that people see."

But when the interviewer follows up that comment by asking if he ever thought of leaving teaching, he says firmly, "No. No. That's what I do."

Asked when he hears the word teacher, what image comes to mind Mr. Voight says, "It's some one who pushes some one else to change. You're confronting some one else with the way it is and make them come to terms with that, presenting the possibility of change. It certainly isn't some one who is just feeding some more information to somebody else. It's, 'What are you doing to do with this? How are you going to deal with that?".... It can be a kind of an abrasive thing. And it takes some skill to get that done."

I chose these quotations because these two teachers expressed the painful consequences of the dilemmas of teaching so vividly, but also because their different circumstances convey the universality of the dilemmas. Nonetheless, the dilemma is far more intensely experienced by teachers whose students do not want to cooperate with regular school agendas or who can not do the work well because of lack of skill. The lower the social class of the student body of a school, the higher the proportion of such children. When children who are unable or unwilling to learn what teachers' have to teach come to dominate the classroom, teachers' dilemmas become acute.

By no means all the teachers spoke to us openly of the dilemma of their dependence upon students. Especially in the three schools—Cherry Glen, Maple Heights, and St. Augustine's—where most students were realistically headed for

college, skillful teachers often received good enough performance and cooperation from their students and accomodated to uncertainties well enough so that the issue receded to the back of their consciousness. In the other five schools, while there were clearer signs of the painful dilemma of teachers' dependency, teachers defended themselves against it in a number of ways.

Some anesthetized themselves successfully-most of the time—like a resigned science teacher from Ulysses S. Grant, an urban school in a low income, racially mixed, deteriorating neighborhood. Asked to think about the best and worst things in the last week, she had this to say:

> Mrs. Gardiner: Well, I really don't know how to answer that. My days, I don't feel are out of the ordinary. Every day is pretty much the same. You find success when the experiment goes well or the kids are busy. The busier they are, the more they must be enjoying what they are doing. If you have greater feedback, this type of thing, then you feel successful. If I don't—now today was OK. It really wasn't that bad, but there have been days where it is just like pulling teeth and you feel very discouraged.
>
> Interviewer: Has the last week been average?
>
> Mrs. Gardiner: It's been average. You have some days and you have just one class on some of those days. The test I gave [my advanced class] last Friday ended up being very discouraging. The period had hardly started when they were handing these papers [in] which showed total lack of study. You don't want to take it personally, but you are immediately thinking, "I didn't handle this material right." For some reason I didn't motivate them or whatever it was. When you think about it and you look over the test, and you think about the past years, you realize it's not really your fault. They are not doing anything. Most of the kids told me when I went up to them personally [and asked] "What was wrong here? What happened?" "Well, I didn't study, Mrs. Gardiner; I had to work," or "I forgot all about it", or "The fight was on."... I suppose you are looking for something to make you feel a little better when the whole class fails a test.
>
> "I can't really think of anything gigantic.... In fact it's been pretty routine. I'm not depressed. I'm not burned out. Really, if anything, it's going above average as far as I'm concerned, but there are days that are not as nice as other days, because you don't feel successful."

Some teachers defend themselves with a passive withdrawal of effort, while others express an active cynicism like this man who teaches at Pinehill High

School, in a suburb of The City where most parents had never attended college and about half the students also would not. Asked how his ideas about teaching compared to those of other teachers in the school, he said:

Mr. Evens: We've got some teachers here who think that their teaching job is going to save the world. They are world-savers. And if they don't save the world, they'll probably jump off the edge of a cliff. Then, of course, we've got some teachers who don't give a rat's ass about anything. And then, of course, probably a whole bunch who come in-between on the scale. I think I come somewhere right in-between.

I like my job, but it's not going to save the world. You see kids, wave hello, say good-by. We've got some teachers, they actually think they are saving the world. I know better.

Interviewer: What do you think they mean by saving the world?

Mr. Evens: I'm trying to find some words to describe it. They're here at six-thirty and they don't leave until five o'clock at night, and they always dragging nine thousand tons of books home, and all this sort of stuff. And when kids leave in June, they say, "goodbye", but they have the feeling that "my job is the most important job in the world". Now, maybe that's the right attitudee to have, I don't know, but I don't have that particular attitude.

Cause I don't think that I have that great of an effect on kids. But I think they think they have that great of an effect on kids that, you know, they take their job, in my estimation too seriously. It's important, obviously, but I don't think it's that important.

Interviewer: What do you mean by having an effect on kids? I'd like to talk about that a little bit, because you said you've learned better....

Mr. Evens: Did you ever have biology?

Interviewer: Yes, in high school.

Mr. Evens: You had biology in high school. What did you learn about biology in high school that helped you later on in life?

Interviewer: Well, I don't know.

Mr. Evens: I can't think of a thing. I think biology is probably one of the most useless courses in the world. What do you remember about biology! Now, if you're going to go on to be a biologist, or perhaps a doctor, maybe in teh health field, maybe something like that would help you. What I'm trying to say is that some teachers think that their subject matter is so godly important that if these kids don't get this idea that I'm trying to put across, they're not going to be better people, and they won't grow up to be good citizens, and mothers and fathers and productive people in the community.

Interviewer: What effect do you think you're having by teaching the subjects that you're teaching?

Mr. Evens: Very little. Very little. Maybe on down the road. But I know that if I would give the kids a test on what I taught six weeks ago, they'd all flunk it. [Emphasis added]

Other teachers who found their jobs difficult admitted to no self-doubt at all. They blamed the travails of teaching on specific others, on students, on parents, or on administrators. They did this sometimes, even in what seemed viable, though not easy, circumstances. Mr. Marsch was boiling over with rage at students and parents when I interviewed him. He taught at Mr. Evens's Pinehill, in a suburb where incomes were modest but adequate and the overwhelmingly white population stable, while only eleven percent of students who took standardized tests in the eighth grade scored in the bottom quartile on standardized tests and thirty-eight percent scored in the top quartile. He began expressing his anger and went on at some length before I began the formal interview or could turn on my recorder. Though he seemed to me to teach only for a few minutes in each class with the groups of students who had started his semester length course only a little while earlier, he saw it differently:

Mr. Marsch: This semester it's been really strange. [In] practically every one of my classes, with the exception of my ninth hour seniors, they walk in, they sit down, they listen, I teach. I haven't done that for a long time.... But it's not typical. Had you been here last semester and seen my classes, you would have seen the difference.

Interviewer: What do they do? What keeps you from walking in and teaching?

Mr. Marsch: Well, it's their attitude. I was just talking to a girl. She couldn't understand why she failed [first semester]. Well she would walk in and sit down—and she's typical of many of the students

here, at least thirty, forty percent. I would be explaining something to them up in the front of the class, and she would be turning around talking to her friend about her date last night. And when I'd say, 'OK, Sharon, pay attention,' she'd turn around and in effect say, 'Don't bother me with your dumb-assed education bit. I'm more interested about what happened last night.'

And that's the attitude. Well, if you have an attitude like that, you can imagine what it's like walking into six classes in a day's time and listening to that boring teacher talk about academic stuff that you could care less about. And as a result, a million things can happen. Not paying attention, flunking tests, not doing a justifiable effort on any given assignment. Etc. etc. etc. etc. And ultimately failure for the course. ...

Then you get into your problem where the kid is thrown out of the classroom because his language and behavior becomes unbearable. And then they end up in our Freezer [inschool suspension].

I'll show you my gradebook from last semester. Our absentee rate is just incredible. One student came up to me, couldn't understand why he had flunked. He had missed forty-two classes. Half of them unexcused. Just not come to class. That's not typical of flunkees, but it's not rare by any stretch of the imagination. If you opened up my gradebook and you looked at the 'a' for kids who are absent, then out of a class of twenty-five kids the page is just nothing but 'a' all over."

[Asked about his aims for his classes and the relationship he built with them, Mr. Marsch said:] The low levels you have to work on the social problem. Just getting them to understand that, 'Hey, accept the other person's point of view. You might completely disagree with it. OK, but at least listen and accept it.'

They'll have the attitude that, 'He's an adult. What the hell does he know?'

Why should they listen to me, because they probably go home at night and the old lady's telling the kid to get lost because she's shacking up with some other guy. And the kid doesn't know up from down. So no one listens to her, why the hell should she listen to her mother or you, the teacher? That's what you face. And it's very difficult to get to the kid.

These teachers' words convey some sense of teachers' experience of the problems of uncertainty and an unreliable technology as well as the problems of control inherent in teachers' dependence on students. As some of the teachers quoted make very clear, many teachers hold themselves fully responsible for the effects of their efforts, even though they can not fully control that work because it consists in transforming the minds and perhaps the characters of their students. As the European teacher said so clearly, it is even impossible to know whether one has done a good job, whether the quality of one's own work is good. Its result is buried in the minds, characters, and bodies of one hundred or more young people. Whether they have actually learned is difficult to see—tests notwithstanding—and whether they have or have not, as Mrs. Gardiner says, in attempting to reassure herself, it is difficult to know what share of the credit or the blame should be assigned to the teacher and what to the student.

Furthermore, as Mr. Evens tells us, teaching is future-oriented work. If teachers are really to accomplish their ends, then the students must perform well or act with wisdom and integrity, not just during the year they spend in the teachers' classes, but over the many years of their further educational careers and their future lives. The results of teachers' craftsmanship, the product of the daily work which the vast majority of the teachers we talked with set at the center of their careers, is like a seed buried in the ground. But teachers do not have control over whether the ground is watered and fertilized; the students—and all the many other people and influences they encounter—control the conditions under which the seed can grow. Worse, in modern mobile communities the garden metaphor breaks down because the ground is not fixed or stable; the plants are mobile. They are scattered beyond the teachers' ken before the seed can do more than barely sprout.

Some teachers protect themselves from this uncertainty by ceasing to care about the plants that come up; they scarcely even look to see if any green is showing above the ground. Others, like Mr. Marsch, find it barely worth the effort to scatter seed.

TEACHERS' DEPENDENCE ON STUDENTS FOR A SENSE OF THEIR OWN CRAFTSMANSHI

Consistent with the emphasis in the literature upon the importance of intrinsic rewards, we were impressed with teachers' emphasis upon the work itself as they talked about their working lives. Asked what were the best and worst things that had happened the previous week, the most common responses concerned a class or an individual's learning that had gone well or poorly—or a relationship with a student in the same way.

Though most teachers did not volunteer statements of uncertainty concerning the effects of their teaching on students as direct as those quoted, the importance of students as the objects who contain the evidence on which teachers must build

their own sense of craftsmanship was made vivid in their answers to a question asking them to name the most satisfying experience of their whole career. There was more consensus in answer to this question than in response to any other. A majority of those questioned told of some convincing evidence of students having learned in answer to this question. Many named students who wrote, called, or returned as adults to thank them for an effect on their lives or simply to compliment them for a good course. They also spoke of encountering former students who were now successfully pursuing careers.

Teachers of freshmen and sophomores were less often rewarded by returning students than were those who worked with upperclassmen, but some of them found rewards in the success or compliments of former students as they progressed into their last years of high school.

The frequent mention of the rare event of seeing or hearing from adults who had been students many years ago as the most satisfying part of a career underscored the lack of experiences confirming teachers' competence in their ordinary round of life. Although a student's success at some task or new insight might be the best event in a week, current students were not fully competent to testify to teachers' efficacy. It was only when students became adults that they had progressed far enough for the effects of teachers' efforts to be fully confirmed. Furthermore, while changes in students were the fruit of teachers' labors, and students were the beneficiaries and in a sense the best observers of those changes, only as adults did they become fully credible judges of educational quality. Teachers of underclassmen, had to make do with half a loaf in the testimonials of juniors and seniors or young college-goers about the effects of their early high school work.

The Effects of the Social Class of Student Bodies on Teachers' Judgments of Their Effectiveness

The satisfactions of students' later accomplishments were very unevenly distributed among schools in the metropolitan areas where our eight schools were located. Those who sent many graduates to college provided teachers with a much richer crop from which some might return to show themselves as successes than did those most of whose students went straight from school to the factory floor, the office steno pool, the infantry, or the unemployment lines. Yet the talent, skill, and dedicated effort of the teachers was not necessarily at all related to these destinations of their students.

There was only a slight overlap in the futures awaiting students at our highest SES schools and those awaiting students at our lowest SES ones. As a result, teachers' criteria for what constituted satisfaction in signs of craftsmanship diverged between schools. For example, Ms. Etude, at Cherry Glen, in an affluent suburb, told us she was pleased when a former student who has become a Broadway producer took the trouble to call to tell her that she played a role in his success. Both Ms. North and Ms. Colwin, at Charles Drew located in a desperately poor neighborhood, mentioned encountering a former student as a doctor in a hospital as the most satisfying experience of their careers. Each was thrilled simply to learn that one of her students has become a professional, a doctor, something that might well be taken for granted by Cherry Glen teachers where most students go to

college and a large proportion of parents are professionals.

Not only did teachers come to adjust their ideas of success as they faced different group outcomes at different schools, many also adjusted their sense of responsibility for students' accomplishments. The principal at Charles Drew complained that some teachers would say "I taught it. I've done all I can; it's up to them, not me, whether they learn it." She chastized such teachers, telling them they could not claim to have taught material unless they taught it in a manner that induced students to learn it. We saw more teachers who had withdrawn into cynicism or venial passing of time in class at the low SES schools than at the middle SES schools and more at the middle SES ones than at the high SES ones. Those who did not withdraw often switched their goals, seeing success in the passing of competency tests, that tested low level skills, in the mere fact of graduation even with a tenuous record, or in a few students returning to class attendance and reasonably steady classroom effort as a result of the teacher's intense personal relationships with them.[4]

The teachers we talked with found their own worth affected by the accomplishments of the school's students as wholes, but even more by that of their own students as a group. In each school, there was at least minimal competition for and jealousy over the school's stronger students. These students' interests, abilities, and performance not only made teaching easier, they gave an impression that the teacher had done a better job. At several schools, resulting competition was tempered by informal agreements that all teachers should teach at least one section of the school's lower achievers. Access to strong middle achievers was also evened out at several schools. The very strongest students, especially upperclassmen, still often went to what were perceived to be the best teachers, thus creating a self-fulfilling prophesy.[5]

The performance of both individual students and whole student bodies reflected not only their skills but their willingness to be cooperative with and engaged in the academic work of the school. That willingness varied with the social class of the students. It affected teachers' sense of craft at least as much as did students' skills and aspirations. It will be easier to discuss the ways in which the outlook of whole faculties was affected by the performance of student bodies as wholes after looking at teachers' struggles with their responsibility to control and direct students in the context of their dependence on them.

THE PARADOX OF TEACHERS' AUTHORITY OVER AND DEPENDENCE ON THEIR STUDENTS

Because teachers' work consists in creating rather complex changes in children's cognitive understandings and skills, on the one hand, and changes in their developing characters, on the other, it is nearly impossible for the teacher to be effective without at least passive acquiescence from the students. To be fully effective, a teacher needs each student's hearty cooperation. Furthermore, students are responsive to each other as well as to teachers, and classrooms are small and crowded spaces. Teachers can not be effective with some of their students, if

others are engaging in activities designed to distract them or to disrupt the lesson.

Consequently, teachers' ability to control the class enoughto get attention to the task, and their ability to win assent for active cooperation with actual learning from each student, are crucial parts of teaching. The common sense way in which most members of our society, and most educators with them, think about this issue is not one of teachers' dependence on students for their cooperation, but of teachers' duty to control and engage their classes. It is one of the universals of human societies that children have a duty to obey adults. Certainly, the society condemns both teacher and students if teachers are not firmly in control of their classes. Principals also expect such control. Lack of such control is the first and most likely cause for a principal to seek to assist or to discipline a teacher.

Not only must teachers control their charges, they also are responsible for setting the agenda for the efforts they make. Teachers, not students, are given responsibility for deciding what students should learn, how they should learn it, and how fast they should assimilate it. An audience of parents, employers, and college admissions officers, knows what should be taught, in what way, and to what standard of accomplishment if teacher and students are to be considered competent. In this view, a teacher who does not determine what will be done and see that it is done, because the wishes of the students are different, is simply not skilled in the art of teaching. It is part of that art to see that students cooperate with teachers' directives and that they learn material in which they may have no spontaneous interest.

If we look analytically, rather than evaluatively, at the relationship of teachers and students, however, the situation looks a little different. While teachers certainly vary in the personal skill with which they elicit students' cooperation and interest, there is much more to the relationship than this skill. There are more students than there are adults in a school. Ultimately, the teachers' control depends upon winning the students' assent. Students may be dominated, intimidated, bribed, or cajoled, but in the end, they decide whether to grant the teacher control. Fifty years ago, Willard Waller (1965 [1932]), writing about small town schools most of us now consider part of an idyllic past, described the fragility of teachers' control in those schools and the desperate concentration of young teachers upon the primary task of controlling their charges.

Waller understood that students are always potentially able to break away from the control of adults. That control is a social construction that is constantly fragile and constantly rebuilt. While the individual teacher builds it within the single classroom, he or she does so within the framework of society's structural supports and cultural meanings. If those do not support the teacher's individual efforts, the teacher's ultimate dependence on the assent of the many students surrounding him or her will rapidly become visible.

Writing shortly after Waller, Chester Barnard (1962 [1938]), an executive in the telephone company, propounded a classic analysis of authority that makes this dilemma plain. Barnard defines authority as the acceptance of a command by a subordinate. He argues that subordinates will give such acceptance when a command furthers the common goals or values around which an organization

centers, as the subordinate understands those purposes (pp.163-174). In other words, even persons, like teachers, with societal legitimacy behind their commands, can expect subordinates to inspect their commands for consistency with the organizational purposes that justify them. If the commands seem to be inconsistent with those goals, or if they ask more personal sacrifice than that agreed upon between the organization and the relevant group of subordinates, obedience may not be forthcoming.

It is the perspective of the subordinate on the validity of the command and the superordinate's definition of the enterprise that determines action. Put differently, any one in charge in a relationship of authority can exert control only if subordinates agree that the directives given are sensible and reasonable means to agreed upon ends or are expressions of common values or other bases of authority in a social order. Ultimately, superordinates are dependent upon subordinates' willingness to cooperate. Since adolescents are at a period of life, when they are investigating the limits and possibilities of social arrangements, they are especially likely to test their elders' directives. Teachers more than most bureaucratic superordinates will feel the force of their dependence on their subordinates.

This paradoxical dependence of teachers upon students whom they must control and for whom they must set tasks that students have little desire to perform was a fact of life in the schools of 1930 as much as those of 1990. It is a classic, though not a frequently discussed, problem in the teacher's role. However, while it is always present in principle, the likelihood that students will act to make teachers feel their dependence or force them to shape their commands to students' desires varies across time and across groups of students. Students may be more or less disposed to cooperate with teachers and teachers may have more or fewer resources with which to win their cooperation. There is good evidence that the problematic character of teachers' authority over high school students has been increasing since World War II and deteriorating noticeably within the last few years (Hurn, 1985). Furthermore, the problem is much more severe in schools that serve poor children, and in teachers' relationships with students not planning to attend college, especially those who doubt their ability to find work as well.

Many scholarly and literary descriptions of school life describe the complexity and difficulty of the task of winning students' assent to learning in a variety of times and places. However, because the public and their peers consider good control a necessary quality of a good teacher, most teachers find it difficult to discuss their travails in winning students' commitment to their efforts. In our interviews, a question on how difficult it was to get students' cooperation generally drew short, upbeat answers. But in other parts of the interview, these teachers might talk at length about what were in fact efforts to win students' cooperation, which was by no means easily forthcoming. Furthermore, when asked whether they changed what or how they taught in order to get students to cooperate, the majority of teachers answered in the affirmative. Often teachers said in essence, "of course." They defined this adjustment as flexible teaching strategy, not as difficulty in controlling students.

Teachers have very limited resources with which to persuade unwilling students to accomodate to them. While teachers have a measure of authority from their adult status and their legitimation by the institution of the school, students will

always challenge and test that authority in face to face relations. In an earlier study (Metz, 1978), I explored this process at length. Successful authority in a school setting rests upon teachers' and students' agreement that their efforts together lead to the education of the students. The legitimacy of the school and its staff's authority rests upon its contribution to students' education. Students will test teachers' academic and social competence and the relevance of their commands to educational ends. Teachers who pass these tests will receive considerable cooperation from students who are seeking an education. But, while students will fairly universally grant the societal legitimacy of teachers' roles and the good faith of those who play them competently and fairly, they may not themselves value education in and of itself and so they may not be willing to expend any effort in its pursuit.

Teachers must then turn to ways of providing students something in exchange for their cooperation. Those heading for college or for work requiring a diploma, at least value education for its contribution to these desired ends. Within that framework, in schools where students are heading for college, good grades are a powerful reward for cooperation for many, though not all, students. Where students at least want a diploma, passing grades bring some reward. But where students do not plan college and have few occupational hopes for which grades or even graduation will provide assistance, teachers' have a limited stock of rewards to give.

Michael Sedlak and his colleagues (1986) have vividly described the increasing lack of tangible rewards for students available to schools whose clienteles want only to graduate. John Ogbu (1978, 1987) has described the discouragement of minority students who fear—on the basis of others' experience—that not even graduation will get them a job. The principal of Ulysses S. Grant, one of our schools, located in a poor racially mixed area, gave an account that illustrated this problem. He told us, in frustration, of a conversation with a black student about to drop out. When the principal urged the boy to stay in school for the sake of his earning potential, the boy asked cynically why he should do so when his three older brothers, all with diplomas, were all unemployed.

If teachers can not command obedience with authority or barter it with an exchange of goods, what about coercion? Isn't it their right to demand obedience and cooperation and to punish those who don't give it to them? In theory it is. But increasing legal limitations on schools' use of coercive sanctions, from paddling to suspension, are well known. Furthermore, even when such sanctions are freely available, they must be sparingly applied, or they lose their effect on day to day interaction. Fear of possible coercion is a more effective curb to action than coercion itself. Finally, coercion is more helpful in preventing some disruptive actions than in generating active cooperation.

Given teachers' limited resources for control over students, they must adjust both their strategies for control over order and civility and their strategies for instruction to the resources they have available to induce cooperation in both realms. In fieldwork done twenty years ago this year, in junior high schools with diverse student bodies, I noted that the same individual teachers used very different methods for controlling behavior and for instruction in classes at different track levels. Students pushed them into these adjustments (Metz, 1978, pp.

91-120). Similarly, political scientist, Edward Morgan (1977) noted very different patterns of control and instruction, that indirectly teach different conceptions of citizenship, depending upon the social class of a school and the track level of its students. Colin Lacey (1970), in an English grammar school and David Hargreaves (1967) in an English secondary modern school also noted the interaction of students' class background and their track level in shaping their cooperation and teachers' strategies of control. Concentrating on students' side of issues of classroom diligence and cooperativeness, Frances Schwartz (1981) found very different classroom dynamics in working class schools depending upon the track level to which students were assigned. Track level seems to reflect and shape students' aspirations and hopes for adult status, and thus the rewards they hope to get from school, in ways that may work with or against their class background, making them like or different from other students in a school.

There is some evidence, that teachers' resources for control have been weakening over the last twenty years. Christopher Hurn (1985) has recently argued that such a change has been taking place with increasing legal constraints over teachers' and schools coercive powers by courts and legislatures. Furthermore, as the economy ceases to grow and opportunities for children of the working class, especially, not only cease to be expansionary, but actually begin to look bleaker than their parents' prospects at a similar age, cooperation with schooling ceases to promise these young people utilitarian gains. As Sedlak and his colleagues (1986) point out, the justification for schooling for the vast majority of students in this country has always been cast in terms of its rewards in better and more rewarding employment. As that promise fades, so does students' willingness to be subordinate to school officials and teachers.

A spate of recent studies of high schools has found classroom patterns in which teachers find it necessary to turn to negotiation (McNeil, 1986), treaties (Powell et al, 1986) or corrupt contracts (Boyer, 1983) with students, as varying authors have recently labeled teachers' bargaining with students for their cooperation. Teachers lessen their demands for academic work, for time on task, or for conformity in return for students' cooperation. Teachers thus generate resources for exchange, by failing to enforce the rules or to make demands that students know they have the legitimate right to make. McNeil (1986) gives the fullest analysis of this process, showing how students' unwillingness to put out effort leads teachers to make fewer demands but also to make the work less interesting as they simplify it. Students have even less reason to become engaged with it and a downward spiral ensues.

Sedlak and his colleagues (1986) summarize a recent flood of descriptions of schools that have documented such arrangements. We saw the kind of negotiations described by these authors most clearly in our blue collar schools. Such bargains, in which reduced academic demands are exchanged for order and minimal academic effort, seem to reflect conditions in the broad middle band of society where students are headed toward non-selective colleges or toward openings for the steady but unselective jobs available in offices, factories, and the more stable parts of service industries. Most students in these schools were able to do the work normally expected in high school and they seemed to protect their progress toward graduation and a diploma, but teachers found them by and large unwilling to put out more than minimal effort.

DIFFERENCES IN SCHOOLS BY SOCIAL CLASS THAT REFLECTED TEACHERS' DEPENDENCE ON STUDENTS

The schools we visited varied significantly in ways related to their social class. This variation in part reflected teachers' dependence on students and the adjustments teachers made in order to keep students' good will and to set themselves goals that seemed attainable given the students they taught. But the variations among the schools did not reflect only this dependence. The communities in which the schools were set exerted pressures on the schools through many channels; students were only one such channel. Parents and the wider communities surrounding the schools had quite different ideas about the proper purposes and conduct of the schools. They expressed those expectations in varied ways which shaped the school through board and central office directives, through the principal's interpretations of the best way to run a school for the community, and through teachers' interactions with the school hierarchy and directly with parents, as well as through their relations with students.

I have written about these processes of cultural influence in one high SES school (Cherry Glen), one middle SES school (Pinehill) and one low SES school (Charles Drew) in another article (Metz, in preparation). Annette Hemmings (1988), of the project staff, has written about teachers' definition of their goals as an accomodation of their interpretations of the harmony and conflict in national goals, community goals, and their own personal beliefs about the ends of education. Here I will simply give an overview of the eight schools that briefly suggests the ways in which teachers' dependence on their students—and the students' assessment of the usefulness of high school—interact to produce the outlines of their relationship.

Teachers Response to Students at High SES Schools

Three schools where most students planned to attend college and the better students sought admission to at least moderately selective colleges formed a cluster. Maple Heights and Cherry Glen were public schools located in upper middle class suburbs, and St Augustine's was a Catholic school that drew a predominantly but not exclusively middle class clientele. At these three schools most students' skills were good and most students expected later rewards for effort and good grades. Furthermore, teachers who tried could elicit some intrinsic interest in the material from their students, especially at Maple Heights and St. Augustine's, where such efforts were in keeping with the expectations of the communities and the school as a whole. The teachers thus were able to follow standard school practice and to get comprehending and diligent responses from most students most of the time.

Most teachers worked very hard at all of these schools. Most took home a lot of work and spent long hours on preparation and grading. Also most worked with extracurricular groups and invested themselves in that aspect of the job as well. Most teachers at these schools received significant intrinsic rewards from this work. Many spoke of watching students' skill development with pleasure and pride. Many said they experienced a sense of accomplishment as students'

character and relationships changed and matured with the healthful challenges the school—and they as individual teachers—provided.

There were loci of tension in all of these three schools. There were students with poor skills or serious emotional problems and teachers who felt detached from their work and who made minimal efforts. But most teachers found the organizations fundamentally supportive of their efforts and most of the students responsive to them. While they worked hard to make their courses both solid and interesting, they did not have to depart from the standard practice of high schools in order to draw the students into the enterprise. The majority of responsive students whom they encountered in each day's work made their efforts seem worthwhile—despite daily frustrations and failures with particular lessons or particular classes or students.

St. Augustine's provided teachers the most rewarding relationships with students. Intrinsic rewards had to be high to keep teachers, since pay was significantly lower than at the public schools. The school had flexible scheduling that allowed and indeed pushed teachers into small group meetings and individual conferences with students. There was also an expectation that students would be allowed to raise questions and that moral issues would be explicitly treated in all classes, not just religion classes. These expectations were generally realized in the practice of the teachers we saw, and they did constitute departures from practice in the public schools. They seemed to work to draw students into the educational enterprise and to cement bonds between teachers and students. They helped teachers to be responsive to students, without having to bargain away portions of the curriculum. The strength and positive character of most teacher-student relationships at St. Augustine's was supported not only by a predominantly college going clientele that anticipated future rewards from high school learning, but by the fact that students and school staff alike shared membership in a religious community that strongly supported the legitimacy of the staff's leadership.

Teachers' Response to Students at Middle SES Schools

Our schools in the middle of the SES spectrum, Quincy and Pinehill, were the most diverse. The majority of parents in both communities were employed in blue collar jobs, though, until the recession of the eighties at least, many had been well paid. At Quincy, about a quarter of students failed to graduate with their class and less than a quarter went on to higher education. At Pinehill, nearly half went on to higher education, but most of them stayed close to home at relatively nonselective institutions. Catholic St. Theresa's served a similar clientele in a working class but declining area of The City, though its student body also included children of members of the church that ran it who had moved out of the neighborhood to the suburbs.

Most students entered these high schools with reasonably good skills that should have enabled them to master the high school curriculum, though perhaps not to distinguish themselves. Most of the students wanted to graduate, but had little sense that their later purposes required more than the minimal effort required to obtain a diploma. They did not show intrinsic interest in what they were learning unless teachers made extraordinary efforts to elicit such interest. At Pinehill, where there was a slightly higher level of parental education and ambition for the

students, students were more conscious of grades than at the other schools. But often anxious parents pushed for better grades by asking that their child be moved to a less demanding track or class. In most classes, students were polite, but uninterested. In classes for less skilled students and in a few for those with average or even above average skills they were not always attentive and sometimes were rude and disruptive.

At all three of these schools, there was some sense that the teachers and administrators were holding a line, trying to hold students to academic and behavioral standards in which students were becoming less interested with the passing years. At small, personal St. Theresa's the staff was split over the problems these changes raised. Some thought they should change their teaching approach and the orientation of the school to accomodate a student body they saw as less skilled and less interested in the curriculum than earlier students, with less support from home. Others sought to stress traditional school standards, embodied in dress codes and rules for behavior, and to demand that students cleave to traditional school patterns. The latter group was more powerful, but enrollment was declining. It seemed possible that maintaining standards in this way would mean closing the school in a year or two. Indeed, the school will not open in the fall of 1988. Simply closing, or seeking a new clientele, is an option for private, but not for public, schools that have trouble finding common ground between school standards and routines and their students' capabilities and values.

At Quincy and Pinehill, teachers made adjustments. At Quincy, they tried to "be realistic"; several taught standard subject matter with a practical cast which might appeal to students going straight from school to work. At Pinehill, many teachers taught in a traditional way, but limited homework and demanded students' attention for only part of the class hour. At both, individual teachers tried curricular modifications designed to engage the students' intrinsic interests and also to challenge them—and some used personal charisma or the development of personal intimacy to lure the students into involvement with the subject matter.

At these schools, teachers were expected to be firm in maintaining order. The task was demanding, but possible, because most students were willing to cooperate as long as demands were moderate. There was less pressure for teachers to keep up with their fields or to learn new approaches than at the higher SES schools—and less support for those who wished to participate in such activities. Individual teachers were given wide autonomy in shaping the curriculum; there was less pressure or opportunity for collegial decision making in these matters than at the higher SES schools.

In these schools, the forms of school rested upon the fragile support of students' desire for a diploma, their willingness to behave in a generally orderly and compliant fashion, and their adequate, if unspectacular, skills. But students' lack of spontaneous curiosity about material offered in the standard high school curriculum, and their belief that only minimally adequate performance was needed for their career goals, created pressure for them and their teachers to move through the forms of standard school practice with minimal effort expended.

Individual teachers felt the need to innovate, to draw students into the enterprise through activities designed to appeal to their intrinsic interest, but most

teachers and students struck a tacit bargain not to ask too much of each other. Most teachers assigned limited homework and did not present complex material. Many teachers routinely set aside class time for students to work on homework, and allowed this time to become a social hour in practice. There was a tacit trade of quiet attention to a shortened lesson for an opportunity for time with friends. Teachers and administrators stressed the maintenance of good order and cleanliness in the school at large. They also stressed hard work for work's sake. There were systems to be sure work was completed even when students were absent, but much less attention to the substance of students' learning. The vast majority of students were prompt, did assigned work, and behaved in an orderly fashion.[6]

With this tacit bargain, acceptable to the majority in both groups, neither students nor teachers were pushed to seek possible cures for the psychological distance from, and discomfort with, schooling that students expressed with their insistence upon limited effort. Most teachers responded with a similarly limited commitment of effort and involvement. A few brought tremendous energy and imagination to an attempt to elicit more active student interest. A few expressed rage and dismay or withering cynicism about students' unwillingness to engage with serious learning, while feeling helpless to break the pattern. Most teachers at the public schools, like the students, limited their effort and spent much time with other teachers in card playing or talk about their private lives, though they might exhibit a mostly unspoken malaise.

These faculties developed good personal relations, and had active social lives inside school in continuing card games and outside of school in faculty social events and in informal sociability with a few good friends from the school. But they did not talk about school practice in these relationships. In fact, among the men at Pinehill, the subject was informally forbidden both in school and outside it.

At St. Theresa's where there were several members of religious orders as faculty and salaries were so low that most lay teachers were there only for a few years out of a motivation of service, many teachers worked very hard to engage the students. With a student body of less than 300, relationships could be very personal. Some students were appreciative and supportive of faculty efforts; others teased them and carried on a disruptive counter theme in classes. As already noted, the more powerful faction reacted repressively. Enrollment fell and the school was eventually closed.

Teachers' Response to Students at Low SES Schools

At the low income schools, Charles Drew, in a part of The Metropolis which has been black for a quarter century, and Ulysses S. Grant, in a racially mixed, changing area of The City, with some black students bused in from other neighborhoods, there was a visible, acute dislocation between the skills, aspirations, and attitudes of the students and the routines and curriculum standard in American high schools. This disjunction produced severe problems for the staffs of both schools. The two staffs had different perspectives, were subject to different district pressures, and used different strategies to deal with similar difficulties. Still, both had to struggle to bridge the gap between standard high school routines

and the skills, expectations, and values which students displayed as a result of earlier interaction between elementary schools and the community and the pressures parents and children faced from the wider society.

Drew has a dedicated set of administrators and many energetic teachers who are genuinely concerned to help their students. The majority of the teachers and all of the administrators are black. Most do not condemn students for what others might consider deviant lifestyles; many are in teaching out of motivations of service. The principal is determined that students will receive an education which will offer as much opportunity and challenge as that of any high school in the state. She therefore stresses the academic curriculum and has set requirements for academic courses for graduation above district minima.

Despite the presence of drugs, gang activity, and episodic violence in the community, the administrators and teachers have created a school where students and teachers feel safe and where there is not only order but a grave courtesy in the interactions of almost all students and adults. Still, checks of identification cards at the front door and in the lunchroom and the presence of security guards with walkie-talkies in the halls remind one that the environment is an unsettled one.

Many students enter the ninth grade badly equipped to meet the demands of a high school curriculum. Their basic academic skills are very weak; nearly sixty percent of those who get as far as the sophomore year score in the bottom quartile on nationally standardized tests. The majority of students are deeply discouraged about their academic prospects. The school attempts to help these students with remedial classes and a policy of substituting "pending" for failing grades for freshman for a full year, giving them opportunities to recover from early difficulties, but many students still read their situation as hopeless. The all black community within which most of them lead their whole round of life is ravaged by the high levels of black unemployment that their city shares with most others. What they see around them gives little reason to think that expending the intense effort required to catch up academically will reap them extrinsic rewards later. Approximately half the students do not enter the senior class.

Because many students' alienation is visibly dramatic, while even committed students who are eager and grateful for attention need large doses of technical assistance, Drew's teachers can not see their job as one of routine teaching. They are caught between the severe academic deficiencies and economic discouragement of the students and the perspective furthered by the administration and shared by a large part of the faculty, that the students are inherently as able as any student body and so deserve the opportunity to assimilate a standard high school curriculum. For the sake of their own pride, as well as their students' welfare, they want to teach and to help the students learn the "real" high school curriculum which is offered to more fortunate students across the country. The issue of skills aside, this curriculum makes few points of contact with students' daily lives, and only the most skilled and persistent will be able to use it to gain college entrance or a good job. It provides few intrinsic incentives or immediate rewards for most students.

Drew's teachers are divided. Many are dedicated teachers who respect the

students and want to help them. For the most part, they try to develop personal relationships with students that will lead the students to trust them, and so to learn based on that trust. The task is a demanding one. It is further complicated because the formal curriculum they are expected to teach is often beyond the students' skills. They move back and forth between simple skills the students need to work on and material included in the formal curriculum. The task is one very different from that of the teacher at Maple Heights or Cherry Glen who can set a brisk academic pace, confident that skilled students eager for college entrance will follow him or her.

Other teachers at Drew consider the task hopeless, or consider it possible to "save" only a few students. The first of these make minimal teaching efforts, simply going through the motions of teaching without serious effort to attract students' attention or to have an impact on them. The latter group teaches to the part of the class that is most willing and able to stay with a moderately demanding regimen, and ignores the rest.

At Ulysses S. Grant, students as a group were more skilled than at Charles Drew. About a third scored in the bottom quartile on nationally standardized tests, only slightly over half as many as at Drew. The community was less economically depressed, and almost forty percent of the students were not minorities. But the vast majority of students still had low skills and lacked economic hopes, compared even to those at Quincy, Pinehill, and St. Theresa's (though there was overlap in economic circumstances and skills between this school and the lower end of the students at the middle group of schools.)

At Grant, the overwhelmingly white, middle class faculty, most of whom live in City suburbs, felt overtaken by events because the student body had changed. It had changed from solid working class and lower middle class to poor and from predominantly white to predominantly black. Neither the district nor the school administration had given teachers systematic assistance in understanding the experiences, perspectives, or problems of their students. They had to develop such understanding along the way while instructing students in geometry, American literature, or secretarial skills. Compared to Drew's staff, Grant's staff had much less extensive and successful relations with parents and the surrounding community. Many fewer had any faith that students' inherent abilities were adequate to help them overcome their deficits, even if they could be persuaded to try and assisted in the effort.

The attitude of the faculty toward the students' future was expressed by the secretary to the counselor responsible for helping students plan college entrance or seek jobs. When I asked her for a list of destinations of the previous year's graduating seniors, she replied with flippant anger, "Our students aren't gong anywhere," though after some searching she was able to find the list. At this school, when two of our team introduced themselves to a group of teachers in the lunchroom, one replied by saying that we would get an eyeful of the worst there is at this school. Another teacher told an interviewer that a recent valedictorian had been dismissed for academic failure from the local branch of the state university. She produced this fact as a sign of the poor quality of the school and its students, assuming that his act reflected poor skills, not his individual diligence or emotional state.

Many teachers at Grant bolstered their sense of their own abilities as teachers, in the face of students who discouraged them, by desperately insisting on the maintenance of "standards". They graded according to what they perceived to be national criteria. More than half the grades at the school were Fs and Ds. The principal at the school was under pressure from the central office to improve achievement, but more proximately to see that grades rose. To this end, he circulated a list of each teacher's average grades from the previous semester. He had hoped to put pressure on those giving the lowest grades to give higher ones. Instead, those teachers who spoke with us about the list, were teachers at the high end of the distribution, that is teachers whose average grades were in the C range, 2.0 or above. Even a teacher teaching mostly upper classmen in relatively advanced work, thought she should probably be giving lower grades after reading this list. The principal had not reckoned with the strength of informal agreement among many faculty about "maintaining standards", an agreement that supported these teachers' sense of themselves as teachers whose capabilities were better than the performance of their students.

Many teachers at Grant continued to make active efforts to teach, but made little effort to accomodate their style or the content of their teaching to students' abilities or interests. In their interviews with us they expressed enormous frustration with the inability or unwillingness of their students to cooperate and to learn as these teachers thought they should. Other teachers became discouraged and withdrew into routines, such as showing movies several times a week, that minimized demands on themselves and the students. Some teachers made adjustments of various kinds to the students and sought to build personal relationships that would support their efforts to draw the students into academic work.

Staff treatment of students seemed to contribute to students' estrangement from the school. There was more tension between students and teachers at Grant than at Drew. Although Grant's neighborhood was less economically depressed and less dangerous than Drew's, teachers described several small incidents of physical confrontation between students and teachers inside the school—mostly in the halls or with students who came into classes from the halls. One male teacher we interviewed had sustained a minor injury in a scuffle with a student shortly before our interview; another told us of an invader from the hallway knocking the telephone out of his hand when he was going to call for back up after the invader refused to leave. There were signs that teachers, especially those on the halls serving freshmen, where trouble seemed most heavily concentrated were uneasy about their physical safety. One male teacher told us that he avoids being in the halls at certain times. A woman was obviously relieved to have company walking through the halls to her car after a post-school interview. We also witnessed some occasions when students were threatening in their manner and saw one incident where students entered a classroom and started questioning students in a menacing way, although they left when firmly told to by the adult in charge.

At Drew we heard of no such incidents involving students and adults, although we did hear of anger between students boiling up in hallway confrontations. Asked directly about safety, Drew's teachers told us they considered the school and parking lot safe. That they were not simply reluctant to discuss safety issues in

our presence was reflected in the fact that we heard many discussions among teachers of safety problems for students passing through the neighborhood, and teachers rarely kept students for activities after dark because they worried about students' safety in getting home.

CONCLUSION

It is inescapable that teachers' work requires them to create changes in their students, to have effects upon their students that will leave them different. Sometimes these changes are relatively superficial, as students learn to solve quadratic equations, to put commas in the correct places, or to list and describe the systems of the human body. But if teaching is to go beyond superficial skills—for example, to induce students to think more critically or to awaken an active curiosity about a subject—it requires more than a passing involvement between teacher and student. Where students are skeptical that more than minimal learning in school will be of benefit to them, teachers must change attitudes reenforced by peer attitudes and community experience before they can expect students to make serious efforts in their courses. To create such changes in students, teachers must think deeply about their teaching strategies and they must become personally involved with their students to at least some degree.

Such a task requires a great deal of effort. More important, it requires constant checking of results and corresponding large or small modifications in approach in response to students' response. A teacher can not be effective without careful attention to students and to their responses to his or her efforts. This is the more true the more resistant the students are. In such a job of give and take, it is almost necessary that success in the task—intrinsic rewards—be valued by the person doing them, in order for the person to keep up with the demands and the cognitive and emotional investments required. Good teaching requires not only enormous skill and energy, but probably some visible confirmation for those efforts—and a sense that such confirmation that teaching is having an effect is valuable—to keep a teacher willing to go on making the investments required. While extrinsic rewards can doubtless also bolster a teacher's commitment and willingness to persevere in the task, intrinsic rewards are probably indispensable.

I have argued that because teachers' work consists in affecting their students, they are dependent upon the students both for the actual success of their work and for evidence of that success. Even under the best of circumstances, this inescapable characteristic of the work makes teachers dependent upon people whose status is inferior to theirs because of younger age and lesser knowledge. It also makes them dependent upon people they are charged to direct and control. Their situation is always paradoxical, even when the students are eager and able to learn and the teacher effective—though probably no one will notice the fact under such circumstances. But when students come to school mistrusting the institution of the school, or even hostile to it, teachers' situation becomes far worse.

I have cited several authors who argue that there is mounting evidence that as a group high school students not going to selective colleges, who constitute a majority, see little to gain from high school except a diploma. While we did not

study students directly, both our own classroom observations and teachers' descriptions of their experiences in the middle SES as well as the low SES schools was consistent with that analysis.

For most of the teachers we encountered at the five schools serving students most of whom were not heading for college or not heading for selective colleges, their dependence on students was the cause of frustration at best, and deep anger, cynicism, or self-doubt at worst. While a visiting analyst may say that the root cause of these teachers' troubles was students' detachment from or distrust of school, based in larger social patterns that separated them from the school and the parts of society to which it promised access, teachers experienced that distrust or hostility in much more concrete and immediate form. To draw upon the quotations included in this paper, teachers had to deal with students' heads going down on their desks during a carefully prepared presentation, a whole class failing a test on material that had been faithfully taught, knowing that students who passed a test gave no sign of remembering the material if it were referred to six weeks later, students turning their back on the teacher's lecture to gossip with friends, or even small violent confrontations and a nagging sense of a lack of safety. These problems were only exacerbated by the clear social understanding in our society that adults should be in charge and responsible for all that happens in their relations with children. Part of the art of teaching is supposed to lie in persuading the unwilling learner to learn.

With the partial exception of those who worked with the most capable and willing groups, teachers at these five schools were thus in constant danger of failing not only in getting their students to learn but in being able to have a respect for their own abilities as teachers. As I have already noted, their feelings of endangered self-respect found a variety of forms of expression. Cynicism, anger, and self-doubt were the most common.

There were two marked kinds of interaction effects between the characteristics of teachers and students that were significant. Dependence on unwilling students was more galling for men than for women. There is a greater societal expectation that men will be in charge in their relations with the young than there is for women. The violation of men's roles as adults as well as teachers was greater than that for women. Though the correlation was far from perfect, we saw more men who responded to unwilling students with cynicism or anger and more women who responded with openly expressed self-doubt. At Pinehill, where the men and women faculty segregated themselves socially, these gender differences were institutionalized.

The insult to teachers' pride from students who were not respectful and obedient was strongest of all for men who held to a form of authority that was more like the traditional authority of the parent, than like the rational authority of the expert. These teachers were more often men, in fact most often men from blue collar backgrounds, but there were women who took a similar perspective. For these teachers, who did not differentiate their persons from the material they were teaching or from their role as teachers as much as did others, students' restlessness was read as lack of respect for them more personally. Where such a perspective assimilated the teacher's role to that of a traditional patriarchal father whose word should be law, students' disrespect could be devastating to teachers' pride as

teachers, as adults, and as men all three. Such teachers frequently expressed strong anger or cynicism and withdrew from serious effort in their teaching. For women, the results were somewhat less devastating since their identity as women, at least, did not hinge on their ability to control the class. They most often experienced strong self-doubt, rather than anger or cynicism. This feeling could lead to diminished effort but could also lead to its redoubling.

Teachers also responded differently to their dependence on students, according to the degree to which they shared or understood their background and culture. Hemmings (1988) has discussed this issue in her paper from our project on teachers' definitions of their work. Here, it is important that minority teachers in schools with minority student bodies were much less likely than majority teachers to regard their students as morally tainted with the values of what teachers regarded as an illegitimate community lifestyle. They understood or even sympathized with students' skepticism about school as a whole or about some of the style of teaching that was foreign to them. Often they were able in fact to elicit better cooperation and more diligence from students than were other teachers. While they also were often frustrated with students' behavior, skills, and progress, they understood enough of the roots of students' resistance so that they could take these things less personally than did other teachers. Because they were more likely to find the students morally acceptable than were other teachers, they were less likely to reject them in cynicism or anger. In some cases blue collar teachers were similarly supportive of blue collar students, but the many teachers of blue collar background who thought absolute parental authority to be part of their prerogatives found blue collar students' tendency to take school lightly, bargaining for the least work possible, to be an attack on their persons to which they responded with cynicism, anger, or scorn toward students in the dynamics just discussed. Teachers did not have to share students' background to develop an understanding of their perspectives. There were some individual white teachers of middle class origin who were knowledgeable about and accepting of students whose backgrounds they did not share; they were able to work with them more constructively than most as a result.

As these differences among the teachers suggest, in saying that teachers are dependent upon their students, I do not mean that they are helpless before them. On the contrary, our data clearly show, both at the level of whole faculties and that of individual teachers, that teachers can have a significant impact on students' behavior in school and on their learning despite strong social influences from their previous schooling, their families and communities, and their place in the larger society. In our data this was most dramatically evident in the greater safety and good relations at Drew than at Grant, despite Drew students' much lower skills and the more depressed and dangerous conditions in Drew's neighborhood. But the impact that teachers can have is limited. Despite the able efforts of Drew's administration and much of its faculty, the dropout rate was very high and most seniors' skills continued to be very low. For the staff of Drew, with its very low SES students, to create a school that was more effective than it might have been was not to create a school like middle SES Pinehill, let alone like high SES Cherry Glen or Maple Heights.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

While in a sense the argument that I have made in this paper is an obvious one, it is one that is often ignored by policymakers. To see teachers as dependent on their students, runs against the grain of both the society in general and education in particular, however much teachers might acknowledge the reality of that insight in an intuitive way. Furthermore, it is discouraging to educational policymakers, since they have little if any control over the conditions that are alienating not only the poorest students but those in the middle ranges of society from the schools.

Nonetheless this argument does have some policy implications. First, it teaches us something about the potentialities of policy initiatives currently being proposed. It suggests that changes intended to improve schools solely by changing teachers' roles—giving them more time to plan curriculum, fewer hours spent with students, career ladders, and so forth—will not have much impact on the major condition of their work, the students, and so will have limited effects, though perhaps beneficial ones. To change the balance of teachers' experience one must change their intrinsic rewards in working with the students.

Second, should it be possible to move the discourse about education into the arena of larger social policy, the experience of these schools indicates that the sorting of populations into housing that is homogeneous in class and race and connected to schools that are equally so has demoralizing effects not only on students in lower and middle SES schools but also on their teachers. The policy implication is that schooling, at the least and preferably housing, should be reorganized to create schools that have a better mixture of class and race. A few urban areas have instituted metropolitan school desegregation that mixes class while it mixes race with beneficial effects on housing as well as schooling (Rossell, 1978]) Magnet schools in cities that draw students in ways not connected to housing can have similar effects if they are not designed to attract an elite (Metz, 1986). Such schools present some organizational problems of their own, and require some innovative technical arrangements, (Metz, 1986; Schofield, 1982) but the problems are less severe than those in low SES schools.

There are also some policy implications of these findings that stay within the current parameters of school organization and policy debate. First, it should be evident from this account that teachers' pride is rubbed raw by their daily experiences in middle and low SES schools. We found teachers very aware of the sometimes blatant, sometimes subtle, tone in much of the current reform literature that suggests that recruiting better teachers is the key to school reform. I have tried here to present a sociological perspective that indicates that many, even though not all, of the failings in current teachers' behavior result from social conditions that they can not control and that current policy initiatives will not remedy. If this view is correct, looking for better teachers as a solution to the schools' problems will not solve the most important problems with teachers' performance. "Better" teachers will still leave or begin to look like the teachers we have now. If that is true, it might at least be helpful to stop the public drumfire of criticism of teachers that only exacerbates already sensitive pride with generally negative effects on teachers' performance.

Finally, as the discussion of Drew and Grant illustrates, teachers' and other school staffs' attitudes to their students significantly affect—though they do not

transform—students' attitudes and behavior. At Drew, with a student body with poorer skills and more depressed circumstances, teachers built more positive relationships with students and were more persistent in trying to help them because they had more knowledge of their community, considered it more morally legitimate even if not a good place for students to stay, and so had more empathy with students. One policy implication of these differences is the need to recruit more minority teachers. But also it is important to develop programs to increase majority and middle class teachers' empathy with minority and poor students. Such efforts have to go beyond one or two day inservice programs. Both teacher training institutions and school districts should consider models from Peace Corps and Vista training or church-sponsored work camps and service projects to acquaint teachers with communities that differ from their own. Such programs should aim to teach aspiring or current teachers enough of the way of life of these communities to give them some respect for the integrity and enough of their cultural styles to facilitate teachers' communication with students from these backgrounds.

ENDNOTES

1. In a coordinated, but separate study Richard Rossmiller and Jeffrey Jacobson worked with administrators in the same schools. I have counted their eight days in the schools in our total. As principal investigator for the teacher study, I took the lead role in fieldwork at six of the eight schools. Nancy Lesko, a staff researcher at the National Center on Effective Secondary Schools, took the lead role in two of the eight schools. Graduate assistants, Annette Hemmings and Alexander K. Tyree, Jr., alternated as the second team member; at two schools both were present, sharing the second role.

2. At the same time, the team for the administrative study was interviewing and spending days with administrators, head counselors, and chairs in the same schools. While the studies were coordinated, and data shared, Professor Rossmiller will write separately about findings from the administrative study. After visiting each school, we met for long sessions to share our data with the whole project staff. The two-person team who had visited the school for the teacher study then wrote a working vignette describing the school's operation as an organization and detailing teachers' immediate work environment.

3. It is relevant to the argument of this paper that analysis of feelings is not considered quite appropriate in scholarly discourse—unless conducted in the most abstract of terms. In a meeting negotiating access, the officer responsible for overseeing research in one of the large systems in which we visited, carefully queried us concerning what we would pay attention to while observing. When I included in my answer that we would be concerned with teachers' feelings about their work, he seemed startled. "Their feelings!?" he both exclaimed and asked. But people develop intense feelings about their work. As Ashton and Webb (1986) point out, teachers' sense of craftsmanship is closely related to their self-respect. A study dealing with teachers' engagement in their work, could hardly ignore teachers' feelings about it.

4. Teachers' definitions of their goals were shaped by variations in communities and the student bodies and in their individual experiences and perspectives that went beyond the influences discussed in this paper. In a separate paper from the project, Hemmings (1988) analyzes the major components of teachers' definitions of their work. She shows how the social class of the community and the student body affected the way teachers constructed those definitions.

5. Sometimes these classes went to chairs as rewards, but chairs were usually also perceived as strong teachers—perhaps in a circular fashion. Occasionally seniority was taken so seriously in the assignment of classes that these went to the most senior teacher.

6. At Pinehill, they did engage in some expressive distance from school. At this school more than any other student couples engaged in expressions of affection in public, in fact in the most public places they could find such as the doors of classrooms between classes. Students also chattered persistently about their private affairs and had to be quieted for any class to start. The theme of valuing private life ran through the community and the adults at the school as well. Students

used it in many ways to oppose adults pressures on them or to express their psychic distance from academic affairs.

7. See (Metz, 1988) for a fuller discussion of this issue.

REFERENCES

Ashton, Patricia and Webb, Rodman B. Making a Difference: Teachers' Sense of Efficacy and Student Achievement. New York: Longman, 1986.

Barnard, Chester. The Functions of the Executive. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1962. (First published 1938.)

Boyer, Ernest L. High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America. New York: Harper and Row, 1983.

Goodlad, John I. A Place Called School: Prospects for the Future. New York: McGraw Hill, 1984.

Hargreaves, David. Social Relations in a Secondary School. New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1967.

Hemmings, Annette. "Real Teaching: How High School Teachers Negotiate National, Community, and Student Pressures When They Define Their Work." Paper presented to the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA: April 1988.

Hurn, Christopher. "Changes in Authority Relationships in Schools: 1960-1980." In Research in Sociology of Education and Socialization, vol. 5, edited by Alan Kerckhoff. Greenwich, Conn.: JAI Press, 1985.

Jackson, Philip W. The Practice of Teaching. New York: Teachers College Press, 1986.

Lacey, Colin. Hightown Grammar: The School as a Social System. Manchester, England: The University Press, 1970.

Lortie, Dan C. Schoolteacher: A Sociological Study. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.

McNeil, Linda. Contradictions of Control. New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1986.

Metz, Mary Haywood. Classrooms and Corridors: The Crisis of Authority in Desegregated Secondary Schools. Berkeley, Calif. University of California Press, 1978.

Metz, Mary Haywood. "The Impact of Cultural Variation on High School Teaching." (In preparation.)

Metz, Mary Haywood. "The American High School: Universal Drama Amid Disparate Experience" Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA: April 1988.

Morgan, Edward. Inequality in Classroom Learning: Schooling and Democratic

Citizenship. New York: Praeger, 1977.

Ogbu, John U. Minority Education and Caste: The American System in Cross-cultural Perspective. New York: Academic Press, 1978.

Ogbu, John. "Variability in Minority School Performance: A Problem in Search of an Explanation." Anthropology and Education Quarterly 18, no. 4 (1987): 312-334.

Powell, Arthur, Eleanor Farrar, and David Cohen. Shopping Mall High School. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1985.

Rossell, Christine H. Assessing the Unintended Impacts of Public Policy: School Desegregation and Resegregation. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, 1978.

Schofield, Janet W. Black and White in School: Trust, Tension or Tolerance? New York: Praeger, 1982.

Schwartz, Frances. "Supporting or Subverting Learning: Peer Group Patterns in Four Tracked Schools," Education and Anthropology Quarterly, 12 (Summer 1981): 99-121.

Sedlak, Michael, Christopher W. Wheeler, Diana C. Pullin, and Philip A. Cusick. Selling Students Short: Classroom Bargains and Academic Reform in the American High School. New York: Teachers College Press, 1986.

Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century. New York: Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986.

Waller, Willard. The Sociology of Teaching. New York: John Wiley, 1965. (First published 1932.)

IV. "'REAL' TEACHING: HOW HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS NEGOTIATE NATIONAL, COMMUNITY AND STUDENT PRESSURES WHEN THEY DEFINE THEIR WORK"

Annette Hemmings

"REAL" TEACHING: HOW HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS NEGOTIATE NATIONAL, COMMUNITY AND STUDENT PRESSURES WHEN THEY DEFINE THEIR WORK *

by

Annette Hemmings

National Center on Effective Secondary Schools
University of Wisconsin-Madison

*The research on which this paper is based was supported by the National Center on Effective Secondary Schools at The Wisconsin Center on Education Research and Improvement which is supported by a grant from the Office of Educational Research and Improvement Grant #G-00869007. Any opinions, findings and conclusions expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not reflect the views of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, or the United States Department of Education.

This is a revised version of a paper that was presented at the Annual Meetings of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA, April 1988.

"Real" Teaching: How Teachers Negotiate National,Community and Student Pressures When They Define Their Work

Annette Hemmings*

I. INTRODUCTION

This paper is part of a larger project at the National Center on Effective Secondary Schools that is studying the effects of the school as a workplace on teacher engagement. In that project we assume that teachers' ability to become engaged with their work affects students' experiences in the classroom and so also has an impact on their learning. As we conducted a qualitative study of eight high schools we found that our attempts to identify factors that affect teachers' engagement - teachers' commitment to and involvement and satisfaction with their work - was not possible without an examination of the way teachers attempt to define their work. Engagement is always transitive, engagement with something, in this case the teaching task however that comes to be defined. Teachers' engagement, we found, was dependent upon and linked to teachers' ability to build and implement what they feel are "real", or socially legitimate, definitions of their work.

This paper examines the way teachers defined their work in high schools serving communities and student bodies that are high, middle or low on the social class

---

* Dr. Mary Haywood Metz is the principal investigator fot the National Center on Effective Secondary Schools' project studying the effects of the school as a workplace on teachers' engagement. Although I am the author of this paper, Dr. Metz designed our study and collected most of the data. She also provided us with a great deal of valuable insight, criticism and guidance.

scale. It identifies some of the general, nationally sanctioned classroom goals teachers in all of these schools embraced and tried to fulfill. It also looks at the way local definitions of teaching in combination with teachers' personal understandings of the schooling process influenced the way teachers translated their general classroom goals into concrete aims and practices. It focuses, in particular, on the way class-related cultural differences among teachers and between teachers and their students influenced the nature and substance of teachers' classroom aims. Finally, this paper looks at how students' willingness and ability to learn traditional high school curricula affected our sample teachers'efforts to carry out their purposes.

II. METHODOLOGY

Our research was carried out during the 1986/87 academic school year. We visited eight high schools serving diverse student populations. Two of the high schools, Maple Heights and Cherry Glen, serve predominantly white, middle-class and professsional families. Pinehill and Quincy, are located in working-class communities. Charles Drew and Ulysses S. Grant High Schools are inner-city schools that enroll a large number of low-income students, most of whom are black. There are also two Catholic high schools in the sample: St. Augustine and St. Theresa. St. Augustine serves mostly middle-class families while St. Theresa enrolls quite a few working-class students.

A team of researchers spent a little more than two weeks in each school observing classes and interviewing teachers. We had an orientation session with the principal in each school and collected statistics and other information about the school. We then followed the schedules of low-, regular- and high-ability students. After observing these students' classes for four days, we selected eight teachers to observe in more depth. Nearly all of the teachers we selected for further observation were teaching standard academic subjects such as English, algebra, biology, and US history. We observed each of these teachers' classes for a day and conducted long, open-ended interviews with them. We also conducted shorter interviews with other teachers, counselors and administrators. All of the sixty-four long interviews and most of the short ones were tape recorded.

The descriptions that are presented in this paper are based, for the most part, on the sixty-four interviews that were conducted with teachers who allowed us to spend a day with them. Information from classroom observations, informal conversations and short interviews was also used.

III. SOCIALLY LEGITIMATE DEFINITIONS OF TEACHING

Most of the teachers in our sample, like teachers in many other high schools, had a great deal of informal freedom to define the teaching task (Cusick, 1983; Weick, 1981). These teachers had the autonomy to determine what goals they would pursue in their classrooms as well as which methods of control and instructional practices they would use to fulfill their aims. Most of our sample teachers, in other words, made many if not most of the decisions about what and how their students were actually taught.

Despite the fact that most of the teachers we met had the freedom to determine what and how to teach their students, many felt obligated to adopt goals and techniques that would win public approval or fulfill national and local community expectations for formal schooling. Mr. Norton, a math teacher at one of the high schools we visited, told us that "society conceives the purpose of schools" and that he feels the need to adjust his teaching to meet ever-changing public demands. Mr. Horace, a science teacher at a different school, said that he is compelled "to meet the requirements of the community." Like Mr. Norton he strives to teach in ways that acknowledge public expectations. Although these and other teachers did not use the term "real teaching" to describe their purposes and practices, we coined this phrase and are using it in this paper to characterize the definitions of teaching many of our sample teachers tried to build and implement because it captures the essence of what these teachers were attempting to do in their classrooms. Most of our sample teachers appeared to be trying very hard to conform to public notions about what and how high school teachers ought to teach. They tried to teach in a manner that would cause society and the local people they serve to view them as "real" teachers - as individuals who are performing their jobs in socially acceptable or legitimate ways.

We found that our sample teachers' feelings of job satisfaction, involvement with and commitment to their work were tied to their ability to build and implement definitions of teaching that the public would view as "real" or legitimate. The most engaged teachers we met were those who had managed to build and implement what they

felt were socially legitimate definitions of their work - definitions that, on the one hand, met national expectations for secondary schooling and, on the other, recognized the needs, demands and cultural characteristics of the local people who supported each school. The rest of this section looks at the processes that shaped the nature and substance of our sample teachers' definitions.

Sample Teachers' General Goals.

Most of the teachers in our sample began the process of building what they believed to be socially legitimate definitions of their work by adopting a number of general or overriding classroom goals. These goals provided teachers with a general direction or course to pursue throughout the year. They also functioned as boundaries; they limited the scope of what teachers felt they could or could not do in the classroom.

The general goals our teachers adopted were greatly influenced by what they perceived to be national expectations for secondary schooling. Since publicly funded school systems were first established, such expectations have been generated and promoted by colleges, politicians, business corporations and other powerful organizations and interest groups with vested interests in secondary schooling. In recent years, some of these organizations and interest groups have been quite successful at using public fora to promote new and/or resurrect old expectations for secondary education (Adler, 1982; Boyer, 1983; The College Board Equality Project,1983; Hirsch, 1987; Sizer, 1984; The National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983). Many school systems and teachers now feel they must go "back to the basics," raise academic standards, teach students to be culturally literate (i.e. teach a common curriculum), raise scores on scholastic aptitude tests, stress programs that prepare students for college, and update and teach young people the knowledge and skills they need to promote, improve and expand our economy.

We found that the general goals our sample teachers used to guide and frame their definitions were shaped by these and other expectations for secondary schooling.

Teachers across schools told us that their overall goals were to teach students the "basics," a common curriculum and commonly accepted ways of thinking about and applying knowledge. A number of teachers said that they also attempted to teach mainstream values and other elements of America's dominant cultural heritage. Others said that they wanted to teach students important social skills, address current social problems, and foster their students' personal and psychological development.

Although there were a number of general goals our teachers used to guide their work, this discussion will focus on only three of them. These goals were selected because of the importance that teachers themselves placed on them and because they were among the most salient across schools. These and many of the other common goals teachers in our sample embraced overlapped, interacted with and tempered one another. For analytical purposes, however, they have been isolated and will be treated separately.

Most of the teachers we spoke with endorsed and attempted to reach the following classroom goals:

1. Students should be prepared for adulthood. They should learn the knowledge and social skills they need to perform adult roles and obtain legitimate jobs.

2. Students should be taught standard content (i.e. a common curriculum) and common ways of processing this content. They should learn the facts, ideas, concepts and methods of analyzing, manipulating, creating and applying knowledge that all children growing up in this country should know.

3. Students should learn and express "good" or legitimate values. They should internalize and express values that promote and preserve the prevailing legal, moral, social and economic order.

Sample Teachers' Concrete Classroom Aims.

Most of the general goals our teachers adopted were quite broad. They had to be translated by teachers into more concrete classroom aims. Because the teachers we met felt obligated to serve the local community as well as fulfill national expectations, most of them used their perceptions of local community needs, demands and characteristics, however accurate or inaccurate, to give substance to their classroom aims. They used their perceptions of the roles and occupations held by most adult members of the community and the kind and amount of formal education most of their students' parents had, as well as local values to determine which roles and jobs they tried to prepare students for, what and how much standard content they presented in class and which values they encouraged students to internalize and express. The substance of most teachers' concrete classroom aims was, in other words, shaped by teachers' perceptions of the dominant or most common way of life embraced by members of the local community.

There were essentially two ways that teachers in our sample translated their general goals into concrete classroom aims. Most of the teachers we met wove their perceptions of community expectations and culture into their definitions. They transformed their general goals into aims that reflected the demands and character of the local community they served. These teachers built definitions of their work that, in effect, reconciled national and local expectations for schooling. These definitions recognized and reinforced the culture and demands of both the local community and mainstream society.

Other teachers would not or could not incorporate community characteristics into their definitions. These teachers translated their general goals into aims that countered or compensated for what they perceived to be local community cultural traits. The definitions of teaching these teachers built were designed to change rather than preserve the way of life embraced by the local people.

Whether or not teachers in our sample incorporated or left out community culture when they defined their work

depended on how they judged the local people they served. Most of the teachers we met would only reinforce and teach cultural traits that they judged to be legitimate. They used what they perceived to be the nation's dominant or mainstream moral order as well as their own backgrounds and understandings of the schooling process to judge local community characteristics.

The sections that follow explore in more depth the way teachers working in the high schools we visited translated their general goals into concrete classroom aims. We found that the substance of our sample teachers' classroom aims varied between high schools that served different social classes.

Preparing Students for Adulthood.

Almost all of the teachers in our sample told us that they were trying to teach students the knowledge and skills they would need to perform adult roles and obtain legitimate jobs. Most of these teachers believed that their students wanted or were destined to assume the same roles and occupations as their parents. They therefore tried to prepare their students for what they perceived to be the most common roles and jobs held by parents and other adult members of the community.

Teachers working at Maple Heights, St. Augustine and Cherry Glen, high schools that served predominantly middle-class and well-educated families, believed that most of their students would go to college and become professionals or managers like their parents. Ms. Jarecki, a teacher at Maple Heights, claimed that the community she served genuinely admires the "academic life" and that parents want and encourage their children to go to college and become professionals like themselves. Her colleagues shared this perception and we observed teachers in nearly all of the classes we visited at Maple Heights trying to teach students the knowledge and skills they need to succeed in college and the professions.

Mr. Horace, for example, tried to teach his students the material and skills they will need to succeed in college-level science classes. He did this even though he thought that up to twenty-five percent of the students he

had were not really "qualified" to go on to college. He also said that he attempts to prepare students for the occupations and ways of life he believed they were likely to assume. Among other things, Mr. Horace tried to teach his students the content, styles of thinking, discourse and techniques that professional scientists use.

> [My goals are to have my students] learn something about themselves, something about laboratory techniques and how scientists solve problems...[I want them] to have laboratory experience; to see how scientists solve problems and go through some of those procedures.

Mr. Horace actually encouraged his students to think and act like scientists. He had them, for example, set up, carry out and write up experiments using "professional" guidelines. He also encouraged students to find out, on their own, why certain results occurred.

The teachers we met who worked in the high schools we visited that served working-class families had different visions about what their students were likely to do when they left school. Many of these teachers believed that most of their students would end their formal education after high school and get blue- or pink-collar jobs. They thought it was important, therefore, to teach students the practical knowledge and skills they would need to enter the workplace and cope with "everyday life." At Quincy High School, a school located in a community that employs large numbers of unskilled workers in its local industries, teachers told us that they tried to give their regular- and lower-track classes what they termed "practical" information and skills. Two of the science teachers, for example, told us that they tried to teach their students how to solve everyday problems. Ms. Taranto, a biology teacher, said that she would like to make her subject "as practical as [she] can."

> Science more than anything else can lead people into ways to practically solve other kinds of problems that turn up in their lives. [Science has] nice logical techniques for problem solving.

We observed students in a number of the regular and lower-level science classes at Quincy exploring and solving "practical" problems. In one of Mr. Almond's regular science classes, for example, students were asked to determine which of six different candy bars is the best buy. Students were told to measure and weigh the candy bars in order to calculate the candy bars' cost per kilogram. When students were writing up their results, Mr. Almond asked them to think of factors other than cost per kilogram that might be taken into consideration when deciding which candy bar is the overall best buy.

Ms. Havlichek, one of Quincy's economics teachers, originally tried to teach her subject to her regular- and lower-level classes by presenting abstract theories and concepts. When she found that students were "turned off" by this approach, she decided that she was not being realistic about students' futures. She changed her approach in a way that she thought was more interesting and practical for students. Among other things, she had her classes set up and run mock businesses, learn about different kinds of credit and how to investigate, apply for and interview for jobs. Her "new" approach included less lecturing and more hands-on activities. It also placed much more emphasis on the practical information and skills that Ms. Havlichek thought was more relevant to students' probable futures.

Teachers at Quincy, like teachers in all the schools we visited, were willing to prepare their classes for whatever roles and jobs they believed students were likely to assume so long as they judged these roles and jobs to be socially legitimate. Teachers generally did this even if they themselves did not consider the adult roles and jobs students seemed destined to assume especially desirable. Ms. Havlichek and some of her colleagues thought it was unfortunate that the students attending Quincy High School did not appear to have higher aspirations. These teachers viewed occupations that require abstract knowledge and advanced educational credentials as better and more prestigious than jobs that do not. Although most of these teachers believed that they were providing students with a legitimate education, many were not particularly happy about teaching practical knowledge and skills at the expense of the more abstract and advanced material students would need to succeed in college and obtain higher-status jobs. This unfulfilled desire to teach students "better"

knowledge and skills affected these teachers' job satisfaction. Although most of these teachers were quite committed to and involved with their work, many thought they would be more satisfied with their jobs if they could teach different or more advanced content.

Not every teacher working at the school, however, felt this way. One of the teachers we spoke with accused some of his colleagues as well as the central office of being "elitist" because they wanted to raise standards and beef up college preparatory programs. As far as he was concerned, students' decisions not to go on to school should be accepted and not in any way be looked down on or discouraged. This teacher was quite accepting of his students' working-class backgrounds and aspirations and he was happy to teach his classes the social and basic literacy skills he thought they would need when they enter the workforce.

Teachers who worked at Pinehill, another working-class high school, talked to us about the importance of teaching students the social skills they will need when they enter the workforce. A few of teachers told us that they thought it was more important for their students to learn certain social skills than subject matter. These teachers said they tried to teach students the norms, behaviors and attitudes that will make them "better people" - people who are able to get along and work with others. Among other things, teachers thought that it was important that students learn how to deal with authority figures. Mr. Evens tells his students each year that they have to respect him.

> Throughout life ...you're going to have a boss and you're going to have to learn to get along with your boss. Otherwise...you're going to quit or you're going to get fired. [Even] if you don't like me, you're going to have to get along with me for a hundred and eighty days, otherwise I'm going to fire you, which means I'm going to flunk you.

For Mr. Evens and other members of the teaching staff at Pinehill, teaching students how to work with and for others was very important. It was, perhaps, this

conviction that prompted a number of teachers in this school to claim that they and their students found extracurricular activities more rewarding than the classroom.

Teachers working in the high schools we visited that serve middle- or working-class families were willing to prepare students for the same or similar roles and jobs as their parents. This was not, however, the case with many of the teachers we spoke with who served the urban poor. A number of the teachers we met who worked in the two inner-city high schools in our sample believed that many members of the community they served were embracing self-defeating lifestyles, depending on welfare and/or engaging in low-paying or illicit economic activites. They judged students' probable futures - lives dependent on welfare, low-paying jobs and/or crime - as deadening or illegitimate. Many of them felt that they could not in all good conscience prepare students for the impoverished and socially unacceptable ways of life they appeared to be headed for. As a result, many of these teachers believed that the best way to serve the local community was to prepare students for better or more ideal futures; to teach students what they need to know to obtain and retain the steady, good-paying, and legitimate jobs that have eluded so many of their parents.

Ms. Colwin worked at Charles Drew High School - an inner-city public high school that served impoverished families, all of whom were black. Her explicitly stated mission was to take her students beyond "Washington Avenue" - the street that borders the economically depressed neighborhoods Drew students are growing up in. Like other teachers in the school, Ms. Colwin wanted like to provide students with the skills and knowledge they needed to go on to college and get good jobs. She therefore tried to teach her students how to write the kinds of papers they will be required to write in college-level English classes. She also made students write for, fill out and send in college applications.

Although Ms. Colwin claimed that she "does not bend standards," her teaching was nevetheless affected by the reality that many if not most of her students lack the skills and knowledge they need to master high school curricula. Ms. Colwin and her colleagues had to cope with

the fact that many of the students that attended Drew High could not read or comprehend grade-level texts and material. Many of these students had never internalized many of the norms that normally govern academic achievement. They came to class late and were frequently absent. Those students who did show up to class often came without pencils, books and paper. Quite a few students did not do the homework that teachers asked them to do outside of class.

For most teachers at Drew High, Ms. Colwin included, preparing students for better futures meant spending time compensating for the past. It meant teaching students the fundamental academic skills and norms they should have but for some reason had not learned before entering high school - skills and norms that students need before they could take the next step towards college and good jobs. We observed teachers in this school teaching elementary skills to students enrolled in advanced classes. We also listened to administrators tell us about the various ways they encouraged and rewarded students who came to class and completed assigned work. Many of the teachers we spoke with who worked with the urban poor felt that they had, figuratively speaking, to make their students take a few steps backwards, or at least teach them how to walk properly, before they could help them to move forward.

Teaching Students Standard Content and Common Ways of Processing and Applying Content.

Mr. Norton, a math teacher at Ulysses S.Grant High School, summed up the thinking of many of the teachers we spoke with when he told us that his most important classroom goal is to teach students "the material" - the facts, ideas, concepts, equations and formulas that appeared in the textbooks and curriculum guides teachers were using. Most of the content teachers in our sample tried to teach students was quite standard across schools. Much of it was selected or approved by local school districts on the basis of what the "nation" - colleges, politicians and other agenda-setting groups and organizations - want and expect young Americans to learn.

Like others general goals, teaching standard content and ways of processing and applying content was subject to some interpretation. Although most of our teachers were

required to teach students the material in officially approved texts and curriculum guides, they did not present the same amount of this content to their students nor did they ask their classes to deal with knowledge in exactly the same way. Teachers in all of the classes we observed used their informal freedom to determine what and how much standard content was actually presented to students. They also made most of the decisions about which among many common ways of processing and applying information students were encouraged to learn.

At Maple Heights, Cherry Glen and St. Augustine High School, schools that served middle-class students, teachers presented a great deal of standard content to their classes. The faculties in these schools felt that it was very important that students learned as much of the standard facts, ideas, formulas, and concepts found in their texts as they could.

Teachers at Maple Heights and St. Augustine felt, however, that it was also important for students go beyond the learning of content. They told us they did not want their students graduating from high school simply knowing a lot of standard facts and figures. Most of these teachers wanted their students to become "independent thinkers" - individuals who process information in thoughtful and creative ways and who are able to solve abstract and difficult problems on their own. Mr. Stadler, a history teacher at St. Augustine, summarized the point of view of many of his colleagues when he said:

> [M]y main emphasis is not that [students] learn every date and every name. It's that they learn the importance of knowing what to do with the facts and figures once they get them. Anybody can go to a book and look up facts and figures, but if they don't know how to apply them, it's worthless.

Teachers at Maple Heights and St. Augustine told us that they try to teach their students how to critique, analyze and interpret important events and works of art, apply knowledge in new or innovative ways, figure out scientific and other abstract problems on their own, and adopt a valid position and back it up with sound reasoning

and/or good evidence. These teachers claimed to be trying, in other words, to help students develop higher order thinking skills. We, in fact, observed regular- and upper-track teachers in both of these schools attempting to fulfill their stated aims by conducting thoughtful and intellectually stimulating classroom discussions, encouraging students to develop and test their own hypotheses, and assigning essays requiring creative, well-reasoned arguments and good supporting evidence.

Some of the teachers at Maple Heights and at St. Augustine had trouble fulfilling their two aims. One of the teachers we spoke with had to cover 5,000 years of history in one semester. Because of the enormous amount of material she needed to cover, she "gave up" stimulating discussions and the like. For the most part, however, teachers in these schools were able to strike a satisfactory balance between teaching students a great deal of content and fostering higher order thinking skills.

The way teachers translated the general goal of teaching standard content into concrete aims at the working-class schools in our sample, Quincy and Pinehill, as well as at Cherry Glen was somewhat different. Teachers at these schools focused much more time and attention on transmitting standard content and mechanical procedures for processing information than on fostering higher order thinking skills. These teachers devoted most of their class time to lectures, recitations, seatwork or other activities designed exclusively to teach students standard facts and figures. They also had students learning and applying common, mechanical, step-by-step procedures for solving problems, conducting experiments and writing essays, research papers and reports. We observed very few teachers in these schools facilitating intellectually stimulating discussions or other activities that ask students to question or apply knowledge in thoughtful and creative ways.

Although most of the teachers we met at Quincy, Pinehill and Cherry Glen defined the teaching task in ways that encouraged students to, in effect, memorize standard content and mechanical procedures for processing content, some tried to foster higher order thinking skills. These teachers, however, proved to be the exception rather than

the rule. For the most part, teachers employed in these schools agreed to focus most of their attention on the transmission of standard information and skills. They had, in other words, achieved a consensus about the types of knowledge and thought processes they wanted to convey to their students. Teachers at St. Augustine and Maple Heights had also come to an agreeement about what and how standard content should be taught. Most of these teachers wanted their students to learn the content that appears in standardized textbooks but they also wanted and encouraged students to become independent thinkers. We found, however, that the teachers we met who served poor and minority students had a much more difficult time achieving a consensus about what and how to teach their classes.

At Charles Drew and Ulysses S. Grant High School, teachers were working with large numbers of lower-class students who lacked the motivation, skills and knowledge needed to master high school curricula. Despite the fact that many of their students were unwilling or unable to learn and process grade-level content, most of the teachers employed in these schools tried to teach their classes the information and procedures found in high school textbooks. To do otherwise seemed to mean, for most of these teachers, that they were no longer engaged in real teaching. Many of the teachers we met at Drew and Grant had to solve an important problem before they could feel like they were actually teaching in high school; they had to figure out how to teach grade-level material and common ways of processing information to unmotivated students with poor skills. We found that many of these teachers' solutions to this problem competed or conflicted with one another.

Some of the teachers we spoke with who worked at Drew and at Grant solved the problem of how to teach unmotivated/low-ability students by presenting less content in class (less content than teachers in working- and middle-class schools), watering down and eliminating material and covering information slowly and repetitiously. Many of these teachers spent a great deal of time re-teaching knowledge and skills normally taught in the elementary grades. Mr. DiMaggio, a social studies teacher at Charles Drew, was one such teacher. He told us that a lot of Drew's students...

> ... just don't feel school is that important. You find they really don't know [the basic things] when they come here. They can't tell a country from a state. You have to spend a lot of time on the basic things.

Mr. DiMaggio told us how he had to water down his curriculum when he came to Drew. He eliminated a great deal of material and now spends most of his time teaching students many of the basic skills they should have learned in grade school.

Other teachers at Drew tried, at least part of the time, to teach the way they thought teachers in other high schools teach - to present what they feel is standard material in an average amount of time using common teaching practices. These teachers tried to concentrate more time and attention on teaching students grade-level material than on compensating for academic deficiencies. Ms. Colwin, for example, tried to teach her seniors Dante's Inferno and other equally demanding literature commonly taught in high school English classes despite the fact that many of her students had trouble reading such books.

Some of the teachers working in these schools gave up teaching standard content altogether. We both observed and heard about teachers who occupied the hours talking informally with students or showing films and videos that convey little or no "legitimate" knowledge.

At Drew and Grant High School, teachers' solutions to the problem of what and how to teach unmotivated and low-ability students varied in terms of the knowledge and skills selected and emphasized, expectations for classroom achievement and methods of instruction. We found that many of these teachers' solutions competed or conflicted with one another.

Teaching Students "Good" Values.

Many of the teachers we met told us that there are "good" and "bad" values and that it is an important part of their job to ensure that students learn and express the

good ones. These teachers judged societal and local community values; they determined whether or not a particular value was good or legitimate enough to reinforce or teach in class. Most teachers, we found, were willing to reinforce what they perceived to be local community values as long as they did not seriously challenge or contradict mainstream values and/or their own value system. We also spoke with a number of teachers who felt that it was an important part of their job to change or replace those student or community values that they judged to be illegitimate.

There were a number of common values that teachers in all of the schools we visited thought students should internalize and express. We found that nearly every teacher we spoke with, regardless of the school they worked for, tried to teach a number of common "American" or mainstream values such as the value of hard work, individual effort, and fair competition.

There were, however, a number of values that we observed teachers reinforcing in their classrooms that were not common across schools. Some of these values were teachers' own personal values but quite a few of them were what teachers' judged to be "legitimate" community values. We found that teachers working in or for middle- and working-class communities judged many of the values they believed members of these communities were embracing as legitimate. These teachers often passed favorable judgements on local community values because most of them hailed from or lived in the same or similar communities and had actual, prolonged contact with local people. The fact that many of these teachers lived in similar communities and formed relationships with local people caused many of them to know, accept and even share local community culture. These teachers, like people in general, tended to reinforce values that they understood, accepted and shared both in and out of the classroom.

At Pinehill High School, many of the teachers we spoke with believed that sports was in many ways more highly valued by the community and students than the content of the subjects they taught. Some of the teachers in this school downplayed subject matter and talked up and encouraged participation in sports. The reverse was true at Maple Heights High. Teachers who worked at this school

believed that they were working for a community that valued academics and the arts. Teachers therefore encouraged students to develop their scholarly and artistic talents. Teachers told us that the "stars" in this school were students who distinguish themselves academically and/or participated in one or more of the school's well-produced plays. We found a number of other differences between schools in terms of the community values teachers reinforced in their classrooms. Teachers at Cherry Glen, for example, recognized and reinforced parents' politically conservative values while teachers at Maple Heights tended to support what they perceived to be the community's much more liberal point of view. At Quincy High School, "every day" knowledge was more highly valued than at St. Augustine where "abstract" knowledge was held in high esteem.

We interviewed a few teachers who found that their own personal values were in conflict with what many members of society have learned to regard as legitimate values. Even though they did not share some of the values embraced by members of the local community, many of these teachers felt obligated to acknowledge or defer to community values that are judged by many other people across the nation to be legitimate. One of the teachers we interviewed at St. Augustine, for example, used to work at Maple Heights. Maple Heights serves a number of liberal families who believed a woman has a right to have an abortion. This teacher, Ms. Soames, was anti-abortion but she recognized that these families' values were considered to be legitimate by a number of other Americans. When she worked at Maple Heights, she felt she had to respect these and other "legitimate" community values and that she was obliged to keep her opposing views to herself.

The Catholic schools we visited were interesting cases in terms of the values teachers felt they ought to reinforce. Many of the Catholic values teachers in these schools were asked to reinforce were in conflict with a number of mainstream societal values. Teachers who worked in the Catholic schools were obligated to recognize and reinforce Catholic values but they were also responsible for preparing students for life in a social and cultural context that promotes other often conflicting values. Torn between their obligation to the Church and to the sociocultural reality that students must learn to deal with, teachers in these schools often openly acknowledged officially sanctioned Catholic dogma in their classrooms

but, at the same time, encouraged students to "follow their own conscience" when resolving conflicts between Catholic and societal values. This way of paying homage to both the Catholic and society's dominant worldview fostered, on the one hand, the emergence of a moral climate that encouraged open discussions about values and important ethical issues but also, on the other hand, created an undercurrent of seemingly irresolvable tensions between school participants as they attempted to live up to the standards of the church in a world that often makes the realization of church ideals extremely difficult.

Teachers in our sample generally did not recognize or reinforce community values that struck them as bad or illegimate - values that appear to undermine the dominant moral order or that they simply cannot accept. We found that teachers who felt they were serving families and students that embrace what Mr. Sizer, a teacher working at Ulysses S. Grant High School, termed "bad value systems" often attempted to replace or compensate these systems with what they considered to be good or legitimate ones.

Many of the teachers we spoke with who worked in high schools that served poor and minority children did not have much in common with their students. They did not grow up or live in similar neighborhoods as those of the families whose children they were asked to teach. Most were not, as a result, very familiar with the circumstances and culture of the local people. We found that many of these teachers judged the people they served on the basis of their own background as well as on what they saw in the media and heard from other people. Using perceptions that were not shaped by a great deal of actual or prolonged contact with local people, a number of these teachers concluded that they were serving individuals who lacked important values or who embraced illegitimate values. Most of these teachers felt that it was wrong to accept and ignore illegitimate values and that, in fact, such values ultimately hurt the people who embrace them. They therefore felt obligated to replace what they perceived to be bad community values with good ones.

We met other teachers working in schools that served poor and minority children who shared the background of their students or had a lot of contact with members of the local community. They were, as a group,

much more knowledgeable about and accepting of the circumstances and cultural characteristics of the families they served. These teachers were much more likely than teachers who had less in common with their students to acknowledge and reinforce local community values. This fact gave rise to conflicts among faculty members - a phenomenon that will be dealt with in more detail in the next section.

Teachers, in short, generally accepted and often reinforced community values in their classrooms as long as they and/or many members of society viewed them as legitimate. They often tried to change or compensate for community values that they thought were bad or illegitimate. In any case, nearly every teacher in our sample felt that it was a very important part of their job to transmit legitimate values to their students.

IV. THE IMPACT OF CULTURAL DIFFERENCES AND STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS ON TEACHERS' ABILITY TO IMPLEMENT SOCIALLY LEGITIMATE DEFINITIONS OF TEACHING

Most of the teachers in our sample attempted to define their work in ways that fulfill public expectations for formal schooling. Selecting nationally sanctioned general goals and translating them into concrete aims that take local community demands and culture into account was the first step most of these teachers took in their attempts to create socially legitimate definitions of their work. For many of our sample teachers, however, building socially legitimate definitions of their work was not enough for them to feel they were engaged in real teaching. These teachers had to take a second step before they felt confident that they were teaching in ways that the public would view as legitimate. They had to implement their definitions; they had to adopt practices that would ensure that their goals and aims were, in fact, being carried out. The remainder of this paper looks at some of the social and cultural factors that affected our sample teachers' attempts to come up with legitimate means to carry out what they felt were legitimate ends.

Most of the teachers we met who were employed in the same school were able to build shared definitions of their work if they had much in common - socially and culturally - with each other and with the communities they served. In schools where teachers did not share similar backgrounds, either with each other or with their students, faculty members often adopted goals and practices that were quite different from one another. We found that our sample teachers' ability to build shared definitions of their work was very important. When teachers working in the same school were not able to come to a consensus about what constitutes socially legitimate teaching - about what goals and aims ought to be pursued in the classroom - uncertainty about, and marked inconsistencies between, teaching approaches arose. Rather than being mutually supportive and reinforcing, the definitions of teaching that emerged in these schools tended to compete and conflict with one another. Students sensed, and took advantage of, the uncertainties and inconsistencies inherent in these teachers' approaches. They accepted some teachers' approaches and rejected others'. They, in other words, made it easy for some teachers to carry out their

aims and quite difficult for others.

Students had the ability to make or break our sample teachers' efforts to carry out their goals. More than any other factor, students had the greatest impact on our sample teachers' ability to implement what they felt were socially legitimate definitions of their work. Like all teachers, our sample teachers' cannot carry out their purposes unless they have students who are able and prepared to learn the knowledge, values and skills they want to teach. These and other teachers also require students who are willing to accept their definitions of the situation; they need students who are willing to cooperate with them (Metz, 1988).

In order to win the cooperation of their students and ensure that students with varying levels of ability learned the material they presented, our teachers had to adopt effective instrcutional practices and methods of control. Most of the teachers we met adopted conventional instructional practices and methods of control; they used standard teaching techniques that teachers in high schools across the country use. In the high schools we studied where teachers and students shared notions about what and how teachers should teach, conventional instrcutional practices and methods of control worked quite well. In these schools, faculty members tended to use similar techniques to control and instruct their students. In the schools we visited where the majority of students were not very willing or able to learn what teachers thought they should know, where understandings about the schooling process were not shared,standard methods of control and instruction were not always very effective. Teachers in these school often had a difficult time carrying out their goals using conventional techniques that work well in other high schools. They also had a difficult time coming to an agreement about how they should control and instruct their students; a fact that contributed to many of these teachers' inability to come up with mutually reinforcing definitions of their work.

Maple Heights, a public high school serving mostly middle-class white students, and Grant High, a desegregated high school serving large numbers of impoverished black families, are described below in order to show how social and cultural similarities and difference between teachers

and students' characteristics helped or hindered our sample teachers' ability to build and implement shared definitions of their work.

MAPLE HEIGHTS HIGH SCHOOL

Brief Description of the Community Maple Heights High School Served

Maple Heights is a small suburban community located near a large midwestern city we call The City. The community has a well-educated adult population; 65% percent of the people over the age of twenty-five who live in Maple Heights attended college. Although it is home to some clerks, secretaries and unskilled and semi-skilled workers, Maple Heights is very much a community of teachers, lawyers, social workers and other professionals. Almost one-half of the employed adults in the community occupy professional or management positions. About 10% of the labor force are professors who teach at large university located near the community. Maple Heights is a community that has derived a number of benefits from higher education.

There are less than 15,000 people living in the community, 3% of whom are non-white. Although Maple Heights' average household income is approximately $24,400 - a figure that is slightly above the national median - there are a number of parents, especially single mothers, who earn much less. Despite these disparities between family incomes, Maple Heights is largely middle-class - culturally if not economically.

At the time we visited the school, Maple Heights enrolled about 750 students. About 9% of the student population was black. Most of the black students lived in The City and were attending the school under a desegregation plan that was established some years before. There were approximately forty-five teachers working at the school.

Maple Heights Teachers' Definitions of Teaching

Maple Heights teachers shared a number of common perceptions of the local community they served. Nearly every teacher we spoke with thought that many of the families who sent their children to their high school were professionals who valued formal education. Maple Heights parents, they claimed, wanted their children to go to

college. A number of teachers felt that they were working for a well-informed, liberal-minded community that liked to think about and debate important social and political issues. Maple Heights was also, according to teachers, a community that appreciated and supported the arts.

Many of the teachers we met at Maple Heights knew the the community they served quite well. Teachers shared similar backgrounds with community members and many had formed relationships with local people. Most of the teachers we spoke with had grown up or lived in Maple Heights or similar towns.

Because Maple Heights teachers had much in common with and knew local people, most understood, and many shared, aspects of Maple Heights' local culture. Maple Heights teachers also generally understood and accepted community understandings of, and expectations for, formal schooling. Most teachers, because of their own backgrounds, shared community notions about what and how teachers ought to teach. As a group, they were quite confident that they could teach students the knowledge, skills and values that parents wanted them to learn.

Providing students with the knowledge and skills they needed to enter and succeed in college and the professions was perceived by Maple Heights teachers to be the community's dominant expectation for its public schools. This expectation led most of the teachers we spoke with to translate their general goal of preparing children for the future into the more concrete aim of preparing students for post-secondary educational and professional opportunities. Preparing students for college actually emerged as the most salient, oft-stated and, in many respects, most important aim Maple Heights teachers pursued. Whatever else they hoped to accomplish, teachers at Maple Heights felt they had to get students ready for college whether, as Mr. Horace said, they were "qualified" or not.

Most of the teachers we spoke with who taught regular and advanced classes consciously selected and presented knowledge and skills that they thought students would need to master college-level coursework. They also adopted instructional practices and created classroom environments or cultures that were continuous with those typically found

in colleges. By presenting some of the material, adopting teaching methods and introducing and reinforcing norms and other cultural understandings students can expect to encounter in college, teachers felt they were effectively socializing students for future educational attainments.

Mr. Fields told us that he tries to teach his regular and advanced level math classes the way he teaches his night classes at a local college. We observed him using teaching methods that have been adopted by many college math teachers and reinforcing many of the norms and expectations that govern academic achievement at the college level. Mr. Fields devoted most of the period to lecturing - explaining procedures for solving math problems as well as telling students how to think about and apply the material being covered. He expected and generally got his students to sit quietly, take notes and ask questions when they did not understand something. Students were usually required to do homework assignments on their own after class. If they needed help, it was students' responsibility to seek it.

We observed other teachers consciously presenting material, adopting teaching methods and reinforcing norms that they thought would socialize students for academic achievement in college. Ms. Trimble, an English teacher, assigned and discussed books that were meant to introduce students to the literature and different kinds of literary interpretations students will encounter in college. She would like students to get into the habit of reading every night.

> I feel really strongly about developing reading habits so that students are able to read forty to fifty pages an evening on a regular basis; that will allow them to go on to college and be able to read ... in an increment like that. Also, I see it as a necessity to build vocabulary, to be able to ask questions and see different purposes in their reading. I hope that when they leave, they [will] read Newsweek differently than they read Tale of Two Cities.

The effort that Mr. Fields, Ms. Trimble and many of the other teachers we met to teach students what they need for

college caused Maple Heights High School to look and feel very much like a small, liberal arts college.

Teachers at Maple Heights attempted to teach students the knowledge they needed to succeed in college, but they also felt that it was important that students learn other information and skills. Maple Heights teachers tried to cover the material that appeared in standardized textbooks and curriculum guides whether it was relevant to students' futures or not.

Not only did teachers expect students to learn standard content, they also strongly encouraged and, in fact, required students to process this content in thoughtful, creative, and sophisticated ways. Ms. Jarecki, for example, taught a political science course that all students must take before they can graduate. She expected students enrolled in this class to keep up with current affairs - to watch the news on television and/or read newspapers and news magazines. She thought it was very important that young people be well-informed about what is happening in the world and that they think about and critique world events and issues. She required all of her students to question and discuss current affairs in class. When we observed her classes, Ms. Jarecki was often conducting thoughtful and stimulating discussions. She tried very hard to teach her students how to take a stand and use sound reasoning and valid evidence to support their positions.

Teachers at Maple Heights also reinforced many of what they perceived to be local community values. The arts, for example, were thought to be highly valued by members of the community. Teachers acknowledged Maple Heights' appreciation for the arts by promoting and actively developing students' talents in music, writing, painting, sculpting and acting. While we were visiting the school, teachers and students were quite preoccupied with a school play that was being produced. Many of the teachers we spoke with were enthusiastic about or openly discussed this play. Teachers' interest in this dramatic performance was quite similar to the interest teachers in some of the other high schools we visited had in important athletic events. Indeed, the star actors and actresses in the play were treated very much like star athletes in other high schools. Staff members and students talked about and

admired those who captured lead parts. Some of the teachers we met even complained about some of the special privileges these students received. One of the football coaches told us that the community and students are so drawn to artistic pursuits and productions that they have a hard time recruiting boys for the team.

The Effects of Student Characterististics on Maple Heights Teachers' Ability to Carry Out Their Classroom Aims.

When we asked Maple Heights teachers about the methods they use to win student cooperation, many of them told us they did not have very many methods or that they did not feel the need to spend time thinking about or using such methods because their students were already quite cooperative. Mr. Peirce, a freshman math teacher, told us that Maple Heights students "want to please." His students were well-behaved and he claimed that he has never had any serious discipline problems. He and many of his colleagues told us that most of the adolescents attending Maple Heights are "serious" students - intelligent individuals who value education, behave in class, and do what they are told. Although there were a few students at Maple Heights who were not very cooperative or serious, most teachers agreed that Maple Heights students were willing to act out their roles in ways that enabled the faculty to act out theirs. Students, in other words, accepted and shared their teachers' definition of the educational process.

Because students were so willing to please, Maple Heights teachers spent very little time disciplining and a great deal of time instructing. Most teachers were able to control student behavior by using relatively simple techniques. Eye contact, calling out a students' name, threatening to lower grades and the like were sufficient and effective methods of control used by nearly every teacher we observed. These simple techniques for controlling behavior complemented and supported teachers' attempts to fulfill their classroom aims. They did not undermine or take the place of instructional practices that transmit what teachers thought were legitimate knowledge, skills and values.

Teachers at Maple Heights also thought that many of their students were "bright" and able to learn. Many of

the teachers we met believed that most of their students had the background, knowledge and skills needed to master high school curricula. They told us that students were well-informed, intellectually curious and not afraid to correct or question their teachers. Teachers claimed that their students expect them to know a great deal about their subjects and that students love to challenge them. Ms. Jarecki said that students often "test" new teachers to find out how much they know and to decide for themselves whether or not they are competent to teach. She said that students are just waiting for teachers to misspell a word so that they can correct them. Students will actually go out and check up on what she and other teachers tell them in class. Mr. Crown told us that during his first year of teaching he stayed up late at night working out all of the problems in the textbook he was using so that students would not trip him up. Maple Heights students, it seems, kept teachers on their toes.

In part because students were perceived to be "bright," curious and challenging, teachers adopted a number of instructional practices that would allow them to transmit and "show off" their knowledge about their subjects. They also adopted practices that cultivated or directed their students' intellectual challenges and curiosity. We listened to teachers delivering lectures full of "advanced" knowledge and information that did not appear in students' textbooks. Teachers also conducted stimulating discussions, helped students to set up and carry out their own projects or designed experiments that students were asked to interpret or analyze on their own. The instructional practices teachers' adopted, in other words, were very much shaped and informed by student characteristics and expectations - characteristics and expectations that they themselves shared.

In short, the teachers we met at Maple Heights High School were able to build and implement shared definitions of their work that nearly everyone - staff, students and parents - agreed were socially legitimate. The definitions Maple Heights teachers spun reflected local community culture and reinforced each other. Because Maple Heights teachers worked with willing and able students, most were able to control classroom behavior using simple albeit efficient techniques and to transmit a great deal of what they deemed to be legitimate knowledge, skills and values. Most of the teachers we met at Maple Heights

genuinely felt like "real" teachers; they felt they were fulfilling national as well as local expectations for secondary schooling. They were, as a result, among the most satisfied, involved and committed teachers in our sample.

ULYSSES S. GRANT HIGH SCHOOL

Brief Description of the Community Grant High School Served

The City is located at the center of one of the most racially segregated urban areas in the country. Over one million people live in The City's larger metropolitan area. About 27% of The City's population is non-white while most of the suburbs surrounding The City have a minority population that is less than 5%.

Many of The City's adults are unskilled or semi-skilled laborers who work for local industries. According to 1980 census data, The City's labor force has proportionately more blue-collar workers than almost any other city its size. Only 19% of the employed adults in The City are professionals or managers; another 19% of the people live in poverty. The average household income in The City is less than $19,000 - a figure that is below the national median. Only 27% of the adults over the age of 25 who live in The City ever attended college.

Ulysses S. Grant High School is one of slightly over one dozen public secondary schools serving The City's young people. For many years, the high school was a neighborhood school; it served children growing up in the area immediately surrounding it. Most of the students teachers worked with in the first ten years after the school was founded in the early sixties were white and working class.

Over the years, demographic shifts and a city-wide desegregation plan significantly changed Grant's student population. The neighborhoods surrounding the school became less stable and more economically depressed. Working-class families living near the school began to move out and poorer, less secure families began to move in. In the mid-seventies, Grant was forced to accept students from outside of the immediate neighborhood when the city carried out a court order to desegregate the schools. As a result of these changes, Grant started to enroll large numbers of lower-class black students. By the time we conducted our study, Grant's minority student population had grown significantly. 57% of the approximately 1600 students enrolled in the school were black. Many of these students were growing up in lower-class homes. There were slightly

over one hundred teachers serving these students when we visited the school in 1987.

Grant Teachers' Definitions of Teaching.

Grant teachers did not share the same backgrounds with each other or with many of their black students. We met a number of older, mostly white teachers who knew very little about the circumstances and way of life embraced by the black families they served. These teachers generally condemned the lifestyles they thought the parents of their black students were embracing. We also spoke with a few black teachers who seemed to be much more familiar with and accepting of lower-class black culture. These teachers reinforced some of the cultural traits their black learned at home even though some of these traits conflicted with mainstream or middle-class culture. Other teachers at Grant were bicultural; they appeared to know a great deal about their black students' background and about the way of life and expectations for schooling embraced by middle-class Americans. These varying degrees of knowledge about and acceptance of lower-class black and mainstream culture greatly affected the way Grant teachers defined or attempted to define their work.

We met a number of white teachers who had been working at Grant or similar schools for over twenty years. When they were hired, most of these teachers' students were living near the schools they attended and were growing up in economically stable, working-class families. Although some of these families were black, most of the students these teachers worked with during the first ten years of their careers were white. Many of these "veteran" teachers had gotten to know and accepted the way of life embraced by these families and they had spun definitions of their work that took community characteristics into account.

During the seventies, veteran teachers suddenly found themselves working with large numbers of black students living in distant and impoverished neighborhoods. Teachers who had served communities they knew and accepted for a decade now found themselves serving poor and minority students they had very little in common with and that they knew very little about.

When we asked veteran teachers to tell us about the neighborhoods their students were from, most described them as places full of crime, poverty and despair. We found that veteran teachers had very little actual contact with the families they served and that their perceptions of students' homes and backgrounds were largely shaped by their own upbringing, the media and what other teachers told them. Many of the veteran teachers we met believed that many of their students were growing up in single-parent families that depended on welfare to survive. Some claimed that quite a few of their students were neglected or mistreated at home. A few teachers said that the neighborhoods most of their black students were growing up in are crime-ridden. When we asked Mr. Sizer, a veteran math teacher, what the neighborhoods he served were like he said:

> Well, high crime areas, dope, prostitution ... child molestations, beatings, uh, everything you would imagine about the inner-city.

Most of the veteran teachers we met at Grant judged the communities they served on the basis of these and other perceptions. Many concluded that they were working for people who embraced illegitimate and self-defeating lifestyles. Because many of these teachers thought that the cultures of the communities they were serving were illegitimate or harmful, most could not in all good conscience reinforce or incorporate what they perceived to be local community culture into their definitions. Rather than build new definitions of their work that incorporate the cultures of their "new" students, many of these teachers tried to hang onto and implement the definitions of teaching they had built before the school was integrated. Most veteran teachers thought that the definitions they had built during the first years of their careers were good ones and that they would benefit the communities they were now serving. These definitions, they believed, would change students in ways that would, in the long run, allow them to lead more productive, legitimate lives.

Many of Grants' veteran teachers wanted to teach their students what they believed were the knowledge and social skills adults need to obtain and retain legitimate jobs. Mr. Sizer, among others, stressed the importance of

teaching students how to obey and respect authority figures. Ms. Gardner told us that her most important aim is to help students to "become better equipped young adults." She wanted to teach her students to be "self-responsible" and "self-disciplined" - to do what they are told to do when they are told to do it. Other veteran teachers wanted their students to learn how to show up to class on time (i.e., to learn how to be prompt) and how to follow directions and rules. A few of the veteran teachers we met tried to discourage students from adopting the lifestyles they thought many of their parents embraced. We listened to one teacher, for example, lecturing to students about the problems and hardships associated with teenage pregnancy and single-parenthood.

Many of the veteran teachers we spoke with and observed also felt it was very important that students learn grade-level standard content and common procedures for processing content. Teaching standard content and ways of processing knowledge was, however, something of a problem for these teachers. Many if not most of their students lacked the skills needed to master high school curricula. Despite the fact that many of their students had trouble learning grade-level content, most of the veteran teachers we met were quite adamant about teaching students the material that appeared in the high school-level textbooks they were using.

Veteran teachers also wanted to teach students "good" values. Mr. Sizer claimed that a number of Grant students have internalized "bad value systems" and that it is one of his duties to replace these systems with more legitimate ones. He told us that he and many of his colleagues are...

> ... trying to get our own value system, the middle-class values system, if you will, put upon students who haven't gotten them.

Mr. Voight told the interviewer that he teaches his students legitimate values "everytime I see a chance." We observed Ms. Yertle lecturing to her students about the value of hard work, individual achievement and other "old American values." Many veteran teachers considered the aim of teaching students good values to be in some ways more important than other aims. They thought, in any case, that if their students would learn to embrace and express "good"

values (and norms) they would be able to carry out most of their other classroom aims much more easily.

There were a few teachers at Grant who had much more in common with their students than many of the veteran teachers we met. We spoke with and observed a few black teachers who shared cultural backgrounds and characteristics with many of the black students enrolled in the school. These teachers seemed to be much more accepting of lower-class black culture and much less accepting of the culture veteran teachers were trying to promote. Rather than concentrate on changing or compensating for their students home culture, many of these teachers consciously and unconsciously reinforced the way of life embraced by lower-class blacks living in The City.

We met a group of black women teachers who were among those who reinforced many aspects of their black students' home culture. Ms. Herst was a member of this group. She knew and expressed many of the cultural traits embraced by her black students. She often spoke black English when she conversed informally with her students and friends and she shared many of the local black community's values and beliefs. When she defined her work, Ms. Herst took local black culture and lifestyles into account. We found that her definition of teaching conflicted in many ways with those that had been built by veteran teachers. She, for example, prepared some of her female students for the future by giving them informal advice about how to cope with unreliable men and single-parenthood. Rather than condemn or discourage single-parenthood, Ms. Herst, herself a single-parent, appeared to accept the fact that many of the lower-class black students attending Grant might find themselves adopting this way of life.

Ms. Herst and some of her black colleagues were also much more content than veteran teachers to emphasize and teach students basic or elementary information and skills. They were also much more present-oriented; they seemed to be more interested in getting their students through high school than in preparing them for adult roles and jobs. They concentrated on short-term goals, like helping students to pass the competency exam required by the school district, rather than on long-term ones.

Ms. Herst and many of her black friends tended not to associate with many of the veteran teachers we met at Grant. They not only established physical boundaries between themselves and veteran teachers, they also maintained ethnic boundaries. During their breaks, Ms. Herst and her friends often isolated themselves in an empty room where they spoke about the concerns and lives of black people living in The City. One of the consequences of these teachers' separatism, in addition to the effect that it had on the way these teachers defined their work, was that there was little or no communication between them and veteran teachers. There was, in other words, little or no cultural sharing. This lack of communication fostered the emergence of a number of tensions and misunderstandings between these two groups of teachers.

We also met teachers at Grant who were knowledgeable about both the culture embraced by lower-class blacks and America's mainstream, middle-class culture. These teachers knew where their black students were coming from but they also knew where mainstream Americans wanted them to go. These teachers neither overtly condemned urban black culture nor did they reinforce aspects of black culture that appeared to conflict with the culture embraced by mainstream, middle-class Americans. These teachers used their knowledge of both cultures to teach students how to cope with and live in two worlds - the world of impoverished urban blacks and the world of successful middle-class Americans.

We met a black English teacher named Ms. Thompson who used her knowledge about lower-class black and mainstream, middle-class culture to define her work. She was quite familiar with the lifestyles and plight of The City's black population. Her familiarity with local black culture and concerns coupled with her own identity as a black person caused her to be quite accepting of and sympathetic towards the black students enrolled in her classes. Ms. Thompson, however, was also quite knowledgeable about mainstream culture. Her educational background and middle-class status greatly influenced her decisions about what and how she taught her students.

Ms. Thompson incorporated the best aspects of her more ethnocentric colleagues' approaches into her definition of teaching. Like Ms. Herst, she tried to understand and

genuinely cared about her students present lives. She, for example, encouraged her students to write about their personal lives and problems in their essays. At the same time, this teacher also cared about students' future lives. Like many of the veteran teachers we met, she felt that it was important that students learn the knowledge, skills and values needed to assume "legitimate" roles and occupations. She therefore tried to teach her students the information and skills that would allow them to succeed in post-secondary schools and the workplace.

The Effects of Students' Characteristics on Grant Teachers' Ability to Carry Out Their Classrrom Aims.

According to veteran teachers, students at Grant are not as "good" as they used to be. Ms. Yertle said that "bright" students are "past history" and Ms. Gardner claimed her students have "lower study skills and lower backgrounds" than those she had ten years ago. Grant students did appear to lack much of the knowledge, skills and understandings needed to learn what these and other teachers believed high school students should know. During the year that we visited the school, only 30% of the students who attended Grant had scored at or above the national average on a standardized reading test, one-third of the freshman class failed their subjects and 10% of the seniors were still trying to pass a competency test, normed for eighth graders, that they must pass in order to graduate.

Teachers also told us that a number of the students who attend Grant are not very willing to learn. Students, they claimed, often come to class late or are absent much of the time. Many of the students who do show up to class like to disrupt the lesson or refuse to do what teachers ask them to do. Some students were extremely disrespectful. Mr. Voight told us that his second hour class ...

> ... can be and often is very difficult. There were times I didn't make it. I had to kick a lot of kids out of class. Real obstinate personalities. You could be looking right at them ... [and they] keep right on talking.

Because many of the students who attended Grant were not always very willing or able to learn, a number of teachers found that they had to spend a great deal of time actively controlling their classes. Some teachers controlled their classes by assigning a lot of seatwork or by occupying students' attention with movies and informal conversations. Many of the methods and practices these teachers adopted effectively controlled students but they transmitted only minimal amounts of information and skills. Most of the veteran teachers we observed refused to adopt approaches that while effectively controlling students do not transmit what they thought was legitimate knowledge. For the most part, these teachers continued to use methods of control and instructional practices that they had adopted years ago. They hung on to their old approaches even if they did not seem to work as well as they did in the past.

When veteran teachers found that their old approaches were not working as well as they used to, most decided to water down content and slow down the pace of their lessons rather than give up teaching grade-level content and adopt radically different instructional practices and methods of control. The reason they did this was because they did not feel like "real" teachers unless they were teaching standard material and skills using what they felt were appropriate practices and methods. We found that these teachers became quite frustrated and that their level of commitment to and involvement with the teaching task was seriously threatened when they were not able to get their students to do traditional high school work using traditional pedagogical techniques.

Ms. Yertle, for example, had been teaching for over thirty years when we met her and was accustomed to lecturing to her classes. In recent years she has found that many of the upperclassmen taking her classes are not as willing or able as students in the past to write down and learn the knowledge she conveys in her lectures. Instead of giving up lecturing altogether, Ms. Yertle has decided to eliminate and water down much of the material she presents in them. She has also slowed down the pace of her lectures and spends more time talking about the topics she is covering. When we observed her classes, we listened to Ms. Yertle lecturing to her students about the tenets of fascism. Before beginning her talk, she passed out a sheet listing all the main points she wanted to cover - something

she did not do in past years. Despite the fact that she went through each tenet slowly and carefully, Ms Yertle told us later that many of her students still failed to learn the information she tried to present.

We also observed Ms. Yertle trying to conduct a thoughtful discussion about fascism in Europe during the 1920's and 30's. Most of her students were not very willing to participate. They sat very quietly or otherwise refused to participate in the discussion. When she called on students to answer questions, many said "I don't know" or sat silently. Ms. Yertle was very disturbed about the fact that her students were not learning the knowledge she tried to convey in lectures as well as by students' response - or lack or response - to her attempts to engage them in intellectual debates and discussions. "It's like, you know, you want to create something with your hands and you don't have any dough to create it with."

Many of the veteran teachers we met tried to control students by admonishing them when they misbehaved or by sending them out of the room. Mr. Sizer, for example, did his best to suppress disruptive behavior as soon as it occured. When we observed his classes, he was constantly yelling at students who talked out of turn, left their seats or refused to work. He also asked a couple of his students to leave the room. Mr. Sizers' and other teachers' atrempts to control students by admonishing them or ejecting them from the room met with limited success. No sooner had these teachers managed to quiet down the class when someone would begin to talk or otherwise engage in disruptive behavior. Students, in other words, actively and frequently resisted the approaches that Mr. Sizer and many of his colleagues tried to adopt.

Ms. Herst and some of her black colleagues did not like the way veteran teachers controlled and taught their classes. They told us that these teachers "talk too much" and that they are "mean" to students. The best way to control and teach students according to these teachers is to assign them tasks that they can do quietly at their desks. When we observed Ms. Hersts' classes we found that she had students spending most of the period working on worksheets and other kinds of seatwork. Her classes were much quieter, less hostile and better attended than many if not most of the veteran teachers' classes we visited.

Students that were disruptive in Mr. Sizer's and other teachers' classes were well-behaved in Ms. Herst's classes.

Although Ms. Herst's classes were less disruptive than many of the veteran teachers' classes we observed, she did not expose her students to many of the values, skills and instructional approaches that veteran teachers believed students need in order to adjust to and succeed in the workforce or in post-secondary schools. The fact that she did not teach her students much of the knowledge and many of the understandings veteran teachers believed were legitimate and important for students to know did not seem to bother Ms. Herst very much. She was satisfied that she had defined her work in a way that was best for the particular people she was hired to serve.

Veteran teachers complained about the approaches adopted by some of their black colleagues. They objected to all the seatwork these teachers gave their students and they did not approve of these teachers speaking black dialect to their students. Students, they felt, should learn to express themselves in standard English. A few of the veteran teachers we spoke with told us that many of Grant's black teachers gave into their students too much.

Ms. Thompson was able to resolve many of the conflicts that emerged between veteran teachers and black teachers and students who were not willing or able to conform to mainstream expectations for formal schooling. She used aspects of local black culture to encourage students to learn aspects of mainsteam, middle-class culture. Her approach can be described as sympathetic but firm; she let students know that she cared about them but that she also expected them to work hard and learn grade-level knowledge and skills. She combined veteran teachers' emphasis on discipline and self-control with Ms. Herst's tolerance and acceptance of her black students' backgrounds. When Ms. Thompson spoke to her students, they listened quietly. Her tone of voice was firm and serious. When she asked students to do something, such as write an essay, most complied and worked diligently while Ms. Thompson provided them with individual help. She patiently helped her students to master whatever task she assigned them. Ms. Thonpson was quite involved with and committed to her work; she felt that she was teaching in a way that was not only socially legitimate but that met the needs of poor black children.

V. CONCLUSION

It became increasingly evident during the course of our study that identifying the factors affecting our sample teachers' engagement was not possible without an examination of the relationships these teachers had with the larger society, the local community, their colleagues and the students enrolled in their classes. The relationships our teachers had with each other and with the people they served not only influenced their ideas about what and how they should teach, they also aided or severely limited these teachers' ability to perform their jobs the way they felt they ought to be carried out.

Nearly every teacher in our sample was influenced by what they perceived to be societal or national expectations for public schooling. The educational agendas of influential politicians, universities, businessmen and other powerful organizations and groups shaped our teachers' ideas about what and how they ought to teach. Although the representatives of larger societal interests affected the nature and substance of our sample teachers' work, the relationships teachers had with the local community proved, in many ways, to have a much more significant impact on the goals and approaches teachers ultimately adopted. Our sample teachers took quite a few of their cues from the local people who supported their school. Many of the teachers we met shared and/or accepted the cultural characteristics and demands of the local community and they tended, as a result, to incorporate community culture into their definitions.

One of the consequences of teachers' tendency to incorporate community culture into their definitions is that they often consciously and unconsciously reinforced the community's dominant social class position. Teachers working in schools that served children growing up in middle-class families tended to teach in ways that would enable students to go to college and obtain the credentials they need to assume the same middle-class or professional roles and jobs their parents have. Many of the teachers we met who were employed in working-class high schools felt that the communities they were serving were not encouraging their young to go on to school so they tried to teach the skills and foster the attitudes students would need to enter and succeed in the workplace. The

result of all of this was that students in some of the high schools we visited were receiving a much more rigorous education than students in other schools. Policymakers who want all of our nation's high schools to maintain high standards or adopt programs that will provide every American student with similar educations must be aware of this tendency on the part of teachers to acknowledge and reinforce community culture and class interests. They must, in other words, realize that teachers are often encouraged and sometimes compelled to serve local as well as national interests and that these interests are not always very easy to reconcile.

In the high schools we visited that served the urban poor, many of the teachers we met had little or no actual contact with the people they served. A number of these teachers believed they were working for communities that embraced self-defeating or illegitmate lifestyles. Rather than reinforcing community culture, most of these teachers felt they ought to replace or change it. Other teachers in the same school were much "closer" to the people they served; they had grown up in similar communities or they were much more understanding and accepting of the circumstances and culture embraced by the urban poor. These teachers often acknowledged and reinforced aspects of local community culture. The tendency on the part of teachers to reinforce those community characteristics they share and accept and to compensate for characteristics that they are not familiar with and judge to be illegitimate fostered the emergence of competing and conflicting definitions of teaching in these schools.

Teachers' ability to come up with shared definitions of their work was important. Teachers were more likely to be engaged in their work - satisfied with, involved in and committed to teaching - if they were working in schools where the definitions of teaching they embraced were shared by other members of the faculty. Shared definitions of teaching are mutually reinforcing; they lend certainty to the teaching task and they encourage on-going, constructive dialogues and cooperation between teachers. The most frustrated and alienated teachers we met more often than not worked in schools where faculty consensus about what and how to teach students was not achieved. There was often a lack of real communication between teachers in these schools. We found that there was an unwillingness on the part of many teachers to discuss their problems with

their colleagues. This unwillingness to discuss their difficulties was partly the result of teachers' hurt pride or fear of being exposed or deemed incompetent. It was also the result of the fact that teachers working in the same schools sometimes had markedly different backgrounds and perspectives on education. In some of the schools we visited, teachers' engagement with their work would have been greatly enhanced if teachers had been encouraged and given more of an opportunity to create some kind of consensus about what and how to teach the students they were assigned. Such a consensus, in most cases, needed to be predicated upon the establishment of more open channels of communication between teachers. Teachers have to be able to communicate with each other; they have to be able to air and resolve their cultural differences and problems.

If teachers' relationships with society, the community, and their colleagues were important, their relationships with students were critical. However teachers in our sample ultimately defined their work, teachers were not able to perform their jobs unless students accepted their definitions of the situation. Teachers, in other words, depended on student compliance and preparedness to carry out their goals. In some of the schools we visited, teachers were able to build definitions of their work that students were willing and able to accept, share and act out. In other schools, teachers and students fought over what and how teachers should teach. Students attending these schools were often confused about, not prepared for or not interested in their teachers' ideas about what and how they should learn. Enhancing teachers' engagement in many of these schools depends on the enhancement of students' engagement. Students who are not prepared for or alienated from the schooling process constrain teachers' ability to build and implement what they feel are "real" definitions of their work.

References Cited

Adler, M.J. 1982. The Paideia Proposal: An Educational Manifesto. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co.

Boyer, E.L. 1983. High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.

The College Board Equality Project 1983. Academic Preparation for College: What Students Need to Know and Be Able to Do. New York: The College Board.

Cusick, P.A. 1983. The Egalitarian Ideal and the American High School: Studies of Three Schools. New York: Longman.

Hirsch, E.D. 1987. Cultural Literacy: What Every American Needs to Know. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.

Metz, M.H. 1988. "Teachers' Ulitimate Dependence on Their Students" Paper presented at American Educational Research Association meeting held in New Orleans, April 1988.

The National Commission on Excellence in Education. 1983. A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform. Washington D.C.: US Government Printing Office.

Sizer, T.R. 1984. Horace's Compromise: The Dilemma of the American High School. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Weick, K.E. 1981. "Educational Organizations as Loosely Coupled Systems" in M. Zey-Ferrell, M. Aiken (eds) Complex Organizations. Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman and Co.

V. "BELONGING AND WORK CONTROL IN TWO SUBURBAN PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOLS AND THEIR EFFECTS ON TEACHER ENGAGEMENT"

Alexander K. Tyree, Jr.

BELONGING AND WORK CONTROL IN TWO SUBURBAN PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOLS AND THEIR EFFECTS ON TEACHER ENGAGEMENT

by

Alexander K. Tyree, Jr.*

Department of Educational Policy Studies and
National Center on Effective Secondary Schools
University of Wisconsin-Madison

*The research on which this paper is based was supported by the National Center on Effective Secondary Schools at the Wisconsin Center on Education Research which is supported by a grant from the Office of Educational Research and Improvement Grant # G-008690007. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, or the United States Department of Education.

The Principal Investigator for the project was Dr. Mary Haywood Metz, who also designed the interview guides, performed somewhat more than one-half of the interviews and gave assistance in the writing of this paper.

This paper was initially prepared for presentation at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, Louisiana, April, 1988.

INTRODUCTION

The present teacher reform movement argues that more cohesive and purposive school staff contact, and greater control over school policy decisions will make teaching more attractive to persons who seek the level of engagement considered appropriate for "professionals." Such arrangements will facilitate the formation of and persistence of such engagement, reformers argue. The literature on alienation (for a review see Seeman, 1972, 1975) and work place alienation (e.g., Blauner, 1964) confirm this perspective.[1] It suggests that even among blue collar workers, normative integration, social integration and control over the work process are important to engagement or commitment and their opposites lead to alienation. Normative integration refers to shared staff expectations, reflected in formal and informal norms, regarding the nature and intensity of work; and social integration refers to staff inclusion in and solidarity with other staff or staff groups. This paper will show how, in two suburban high schools, teachers' work control interacted with normative and social integration in their effect upon teachers' engagement with their work. This paper suggests that simple "one size fits all" fixes for schools or teachers implied by at least some of the reform literature may not influence teacher engagement in expected ways. Unique school level work place integrative environments and work control structures influence the model level and type of teacher engagement.

TEACHER ENGAGEMENT

Work engagement in complex organizations has been described as the result of workers' ability to find intrinsic meaning in work, to control their work, and to experience a sense of belonging in a work place community. Each of these elements may contribute separately or jointly or both to work engagement. Workers who are relatively more engaged might describe themselves as more immediately involved,

---

[1] More recent work by Melvin Seeman suggests that alienation describes a relationship of people to their society, not just the work place. Seeman defines alienation as a complex of meaninglessness, normlessness, powerlessness, cultural estrangement, social estrangement and value isolation. Seeman's taxonomy, based largely on an examination of empirical findings, supports the general adequacy of Blauner's framework. Both Seeman and Blauner (more directly) trace the concept of alienation to Karl Marx's critique of capitalist laborrelations.

absorbed, interested, committed and as investing more of their private lives into their work; less engaged workers may describe themselves as distant, as working in a more mechanical way (Blauner, 1964).

Teaching engagement may be similar to general work engagement in some ways but not in others. Teaching may involve engagement in the *tasks connected with instruction*, and in the context of *a perceived teaching career*. Teachers' task engagements are partly the product of how teachers construe their classroom instruction goals. Annette Hemmings (1988) has identified three general types of instructional goals teachers espoused in the schools in our study: skills/content, values education and preparation for adult life. Lacey (1977), Woods (1983) and Nias (1981) have shown that teachers also construct a career engagement which frames their tasks and goals. Woods characterizes these as professional, vocational and continuance career commitments. Professionally committed teachers are characterized by a concern for the transmission of content and skills, and think of themselves as skilled and knowledgeable; they desire to keep these up. Vocationally committed teachers usually have a sense of personal mission, in a belief that they should care for students' personal or social needs, or that teaching is an expression of teachers' own identities. Continuance commitment is based on a calculative or instrumental orientation characterized by role adherence and low affect. Teachers thus committed remain in teaching because they have invested so much of themselves that they want to continue in, or do not feel that they can quit.

High school teachers' work control

Robert Blauner argued that work control consists of control of resources, work place policies, the pace, quantity, quality of work and the pressures exerted on workers. Who or what controls work in schools is not entirely clear. There is little direct supervision of teaching in most schools (Weick, 1976; Corwin, 1981; Firestone, 1985; Cusick, 1983). Also, most teachers also believe that they are autonomous in their classrooms (Sykes, 1984; Tye, 1985). Despite teacher perceptions, indirect controls on resources allocated to teachers (time, curriculum materials, and students) can significantly affect the amount of teaching and achievement in classrooms (Barr and Dreeben, 1983; Dreeben and Gamoran, 1986). The grouping of students into classes that are homogeneous or heterogeneous in ability and the assignment of individual teacher to specific groups, what are both usually administrative

prerogatives, have an especially heavy impact on teachers' control over their work (Hargreaves, 1967; Finley, 1984).

While increased pressures on the quantity, quality or pacing of industrial work seem to have alienative effects on workers, teachers may welcome some pressures on them or (more commonly) on their peers. The source of pressures and nature of pressures seems to matter to teachers. Administrative control of student disruptions, pressures for teacher accountability, efforts to increase teacher commitment, to raise teacher expectations for pupils, and clearly defined, regular teacher performance evaluations may be welcomed by teachers in high-achieving schools (Rosenholtz, 1985; Corcoran, 1985). By contrast, pressures on teachers from parents are usually less welcome (Connell, 1985; McPherson, 1972), and teachers generally rely on administrators to control these, that is, to "buffer" (Thompson, 1967) their teaching from unwanted parent interventions.

One aspect of teaching control critical to teacher engagement is their ability to extract intrinsic rewards by "reaching" students. In most schools, teachers' abilities to extract rewards are constrained by the "endemic uncertainties" of teaching. These uncertainties mostly arise from an uncertain teaching technology (Lortie, 1975; Dreeben, 1973), the obligation to reach diverse students in group learning situations, uncertain teacher-administrative jurisdictions (Dreeben, 1973), and minimal formal induction into the teaching situation (Lortie, 1975). Yet teachers often express their inability to control such rewards, especially in schools where students seem unable to master classroom learning (Webb and Ashton, 1986). Teachers' ability to acquire intrinsic rewards in high-achieving schools may be facilitated by their ability to minimize uncertainty through reliance on unambiguous, shared pedagogical, control and content expectations (Corcoran, 1985; Rosenholtz, 1985). I am aware of no studies which show that major changes in extrinsic rewards produce higher levels of engagement, though many studies argue that the lack of extrinsic rewards may cause teachers to consider leaving, while discouraging potential new recruits from entering teaching (Darling-Hammond, 1984).

School normative and social integration

According to Blauner, a major element which enhances work place engagement may be the sharing of norms among peers and across management and workers. However, norms can bring teachers or administrators or both together or isolate them from each other. In most schools, teacher-administrator norms of informal autonomy and non-interference often isolate teachers from their peers (Lortie, 1975; Dreeben, 1973; Weinshank, et. al., 1983; Tye, 1985; Sizer, 1985 (1984); Shanker, 1985). Furthermore, what brings teachers together may not necessarily be of much interest or benefit to the school or the students. If teachers all share common low expectations for low income or minority students, a school's staff may be normatively integrated with each other but not with their students (Hammersley, 1984; Metz, 1986). By contrast, in schools where normative integration takes the form of a shared high level of shared understanding of the goals of instruction, the methods of teaching and a belief that students are capable, teachers feel more engaged (Little, 1982; Rosenholtz, 1985; Corcoran, 1985). In summary, the content as well as the extent of normative integration may influence teacher engagement. The two schools discussed in paper vary both in the level and the type of normative integration, and consequently also of teachers' engagement.

Social integration describes a network of social relations which give workers a high expectancy for inclusion and social acceptance (Seeman, 1972, 1975) among peers and between workers and management (Blauner, 1964). Social and normative integration are related but separate aspects of school togetherness. Each is expected to enhance engagement.

Previous research has not separated social and normative integration. Instead, recent authors suggest, school teaching can provide either social isolation, inclining teachers to disengagement, or social integration, inclining teachers to engagement. In isolating settings, teachers' social contacts are often characterized by: teachers believing they are solely responsible for student outcomes; teacher conversations about "war stories," social chatter or non-teaching interests, and informal associations based mainly on friendship (Rosenholtz, 1985). Interacting secondary school settings, often associated with high-achieving schools, are more often characterized by collegial planning, task-related talk, risk-taking (Little, 1982) and intellectual sharing (Corcoran, 1985). Interacting settings may have

particular advantages over isolating settings in their potential enhancement of engagement. Work place collegiality, or the sharing of ideas, experience (or, more rarely, authority and influence) among teachers, as opposed to individual teacher autonomy, is argued to be critical to teachers' sense of efficacy (Webb and Ashton, 1986; Corcoran, 1985; Little, 1982) and engagement (Powell, et. al., 1985).

Work control, normative and social integration may all interact with each other and with contextual conditions of the work place. Norms may provide the basis for the kind of social contact and work control that predominates in a school. Teachers who feel that they can control the teaching environment may be more likely to share their teaching experience with other teachers. Where all teachers feel insecure about their ability to teach effectively, they are likely to maintain isolation from one another. Teachers who share their inability to control behavioral problems or academic failure in such a setting may lose status with their peers (Rosenholtz, 1985). Teachers who feel that they have reached individual teaching solutions which bring them intrinsic rewards or allow them to maintain their extrinsic rewards may also be reluctant to discuss alternate teaching arrangements with peers (Lortie, 1975; Rosenholtz, 1985; Sykes, 1984). In short, autonomy in the classroom may be won at the expense of collegial, and task-related social relations (Sykes, 1984). In the two schools reported here, this finding seems highly relevant. Neither autonomy nor integration alone explain the levels or kinds of engagement prevalent in the two schools.

THE SAMPLE FOR THIS PAPER

This article is based on teacher interviews and selected observations in two American public high schools, a sub-sample of a larger sample of teachers drawn from eight schools. In each school a two-person team, of which I was one member, initially observed eight teachers in English, Math, Foreign Language, Social Studies or Science departments. The team interviewed these teachers during or after school or both. The core sample of sixteen teachers' interviews was supplemented by research staff classroom observations, as well as additional short interviews with ten other teachers and/or counselors at each school. This paper also is informed by a coordinated study of administrators conducted by a different team.

Most of the sixteen core teachers had more than seven years teaching experience; some had over thirty years. All of the teachers had earned at least Bachelors degrees, generally a subject-specific degree in Education. Our core sample for the two schools included eleven males and five females. Many of the males we chose were married, while many of the females were not. There were no minority teachers in the sub-sample.

CONTRASTS BETWEEN THE SCHOOL DISTRICT COMMUNITIES AND TEACHERS

There are many contrasts and few similarities in the communities in which the two high schools were located. Cherry Glen and Pinehill were predominantly white suburbs of The City and both contained largely homogeneous social settings. But Cherry Glen contained a largely white collar population, while Pinehill contained predominantly blue collar groups. While Cherry Glen's property tax base was growing, Pinehill's was shrinking. Around the high school at Cherry Glen, developers constructed high-priced new condominiums, new shopping centers, corporate and professional office space. Around Pinehill, factories closed their operations or parts of their operations, while other developers constructed new modestly-priced housing.

A 1985-1986 comparison of student standardized achievement tests in the two districts indicates Cherry Glen's standings of eighth grade math and reading were not a great deal higher than Pinehill's when compared to national test score norms. However, the drop-out rates in Pinehill were not only higher than Cherry Glen, but were increasing over the last three school years. While most of Cherry Glen's children attended four year colleges after graduation, most of Pinehill's children went on to blue collar jobs, or technical schools.

While most of the Cherry Glen teaching staff lived outside the school district (most said they could not afford to live in the district), those at Pinehill lived in Pinehill or in similar blue collar communities (in which most of them had grown up as well). Most of the Pinehill teachers came from blue collar families or farm backgrounds, while several at Cherry Glen grew up in white collar families. Teachers in both districts shared similar formal educational backgrounds. The percentage of Bachelors and Masters

degrees was roughly equivalent across both districts, with only 2% more of total Cherry Glen teachers completing Masters degrees.

The relations between teachers as a group and their communities and administrations differed dramatically. While the Cherry Glen teachers association and school board shared a history of collaboration, the Pinehill association and school board shared a history of conflict. While contract negotiations at Cherry Glen often resulted in quiet agreements (despite one occasion when the union sponsored working to the rule), those at Pinehill had been marked by a strike, and at least one additional occasion when the union encouraged teachers to work to the rule. While the Cherry Glen association collaborated with the administration to develop a peer evaluation system, the Pinehill association had been trying to stop the district administration from using procedures they argued amounted to harassment. In short, the Pinehill teachers association had acted like and had been treated like a blue collar labor union, while the Cherry Hill teachers' association had acted like and was treated like a white collar professional organization.

CHERRY GLEN

Normative and Social Integration at Cherry Glen

> I: Does anybody besides the students know much about what you do in a classroom?
> T: Oh, I think, I think my colleagues do. The people that I work with most closely, and I think there is a certain ...knowledge, if you want to call it, among a school community ...as to who is doing what. Being aware of what's going on elsewhere. So I think that perhaps others are aware.

Most teachers at Cherry Glen shared a high degree of work-related normative integration with the administration and other teachers at the school level and with each other at the department level. A major source of normative and social integration was the direction of the principal, Mr. Coyne. Mr. Coyne carefully orchestrated formal participation in school-improvement committees, extracurricular activities, non-teaching supervision activities, and the formal departmental curriculum committees. Indirectly, Mr. Coyne and the district administration maximized teachers' participation in their departments, through requiring curriculum-focused collaborative departmental meetings. This increased the level of common departmental expectations that particular content would be covered and that methods which maximized

content coverage were preferable to other methods. Across the administrative and teaching staff there was a shared normative understanding that teaching demanded participation in activities within and beyond the classroom; that minor updates in teaching methods were necessary; and that academic content and skill teaching (responsive to the nature of the students) were central and legitimate goals for all teachers. The norms of participation, the obligation to follow the curriculum, the obligation to update knowledge and skills and the expectation that teaching consisted of content/skills instruction were supported by the principal and informally by teachers.

Participation

The participation norm included the obligation to participate in extracurricular activities:

> It's kind of an unwritten expectation.... There are a lot of teachers that don't do any coaching but then they are expected to help at different events like maybe take tickets at football games or to be on crowd control.

Mr. Coyne engineered this participation through his annual request that teachers submit their preferences for particular extra-curricular activity. Teachers were not asked to participate but rather were asked what they wanted to participate in. Those not directing activities were assigned to help supervise, collect ticket money or provide related services.

Another aspect of the school's participative normative structures was teachers' obligation to participate with peers in school improvement. The principal's system generated faculty concerns from required "randomly" selected staff group meetings about the school. Then he formed ad hoc committees to suggest and develop school improvement projects. According to most of the teachers, committee recommendations and suggestions were then either approved by the administration or changed to conform to administrative goals or designs. From the interviews, it is unclear whether the principal or the central office or both were responsible for this pattern.

Curriculum adherence

At Cherry Glen, this meant the obligation faithfully to teach the curriculum, as developed by the department. Teachers were consistently evaluated annually. Administrators looked for a fit between the formal curriculum and what the teacher was actually teaching; though apparently there was less scrutiny of this "fit" with high seniority teachers. In addition, staff members expected each other to follow the curriculum. In most departments, teachers expressed the importance of being able to count on other teachers having taught certain content or skills, so that students could handle later courses. In addition, the staff shared expectations that they would use their preparation periods in service of classroom or extracurricular preparation. Preparation outside of school was expected of most teachers, and most spent time outside of the required school day preparing tests, quizzes, grading or planning activities.

Technical updating

Technical updating was another norm shared by the majority of teachers at Cherry Glen. By this, teachers meant that it was important to seek out and try new methods to gain student cooperation, report results better, and teach content better. During the time we investigated Cherry Glen, several technical updates were in progress; they included but were not limited to: student motivation systems, computerization of school operations and the application of computer programs to subject teaching, and a new system of teacher evaluation. In other words, teachers shared, usually in small, sometimes departmental, groups a willingness to initiate technical innovations.

Content/skills focus

Teachers expected that they and their peers would concentrate on the teaching of academic content and skills, usually translated as the obligation to cover the required content. At the same time, teachers were expected to work at ways in which to enlist student participation in that kind of learning. Teachers who were part of a group transferred from the junior high school with the ninth grade, four years before the study, noted that high school teachers seemed more "content" than "kid"-oriented. Two of the former junior high school teachers spoke of changing their practices to conform to this staff expectation, one to

keep up with colleagues' content coverage expectations. Several teachers noted that one of the few ways to get into trouble at the school was to depart from the curriculum. However, most teachers rejected content orientations which treated students as mere receptacles for teacher knowledge. Many teachers spoke of various clever ways by which to enlist student support and interest in the learning of content and skills.

"Professional" engagement

The formal and informal sharing of pedagogical techniques and content directly supported teachers' "professional" engagement with their work. The administration required regular departmental updating of curriculum, though teachers were allowed to decide what texts to use, what units to include and to what extent unit and lesson content would be controlled by the department or by the teacher. Departments met regularly, and departmental teachers were located in proximity to each other. In the school, most staff tended to associate with other department members. This sharing also indirectly exerted a control on what was taught and how it would be taught in various departments. School and departmental norms supporting the teaching of academic content and skills through recently developed methods allowed teachers to share knowledge and techniques with other department members. This helped them to define standards by which students should or would be evaluated. This clarity in the task and acceptance of limited, relatively clear, measures of success effectively reduced some of the "endemic uncertainties" associated with teaching. However, this system tended to standardize what was taught, how fast it would be taught, and what methods would be used.

Some department members, stressed the clarifying and collegial aspects of departmental sharing, while others, referred more often to standardization of content, grading or methods. For example, a humanities teacher referred to collegiality in and out of department meetings:

> Well, we do plan to do this at our meetings, occasionally. We ask that they bring along samples and everything. That's very planned ...but most of the rest of it is just the great respect we feel for one another, that we're, we're, we're genuinely interested in what the other person is doing, and we'll ask him, well, "Where are you now in the subject? Are you doing anything different for a model ____?", we're just always, always interested. So, you know, that's to a certain extent ...spontaneous, but it's something you do as almost a natural reflex. You're always checking out, and, and sometimes it's just a natural place to

> go for a resource. You think, "Gosh, I need a good quiz on that part of the unit. I wonder whether so and so would give me one."

In a non-humanities subject area, sharing was different, the purpose being mainly the coordination of effort and homogenization of content, grading and methods.

> You find out that what you're doing is what the other person is doing. You find out you're on the right track. You basically are covering the same material at the same time and with the same sort of tests. And you find out that you're not, quote, too easy, too hard.

At Cherry Glen teacher engagement with the school and their school teaching was considerable, especially among those originally recruited to the school. Most teachers reported and exhibited substantial time within and outside the school day. Engagement was enhanced by earlier district recruitment practices, and the respect teachers held for each others' knowledge and teaching abilities.

Recruitment-especially in the early years of the school-of staff members interested in and capable of competent content/skills instruction contributed to the school-wide "professional" engagement. Several of the original staff members who came to Cherry Glen did so by hearing about the school's reputation for academic excellence, or the school's having requested their joining the staff. Teachers expressed pride in either having been recruited or being one of the select teachers who were good enough to teach at Cherry Glen. Declining enrollment and a dramatic influx of junior high school teachers transferred with the ninth grade had changed the recruiting system which the district had used to develop a staff of highly competent and motivated teachers. Most transferees were asked to choose which of the two high schools they would like to join, and most referred to this choice as one with which they were happy. A recent transferee commented about other teachers in the school:

> I have to really respect them and admire them. I definitely think that has an effect on, on what I do, because I want to try to do as good a job as they're doing. I'm maybe not able to, but I do have that sort of respect, and I, I do look up to people. Even though I've taught twenty-two years, I think that there are people here that deserve that kind of respect.

Summary: Integration at Cherry Glen

For teachers at Cherry Glen, shared norms of participation and common foci on technical educational goals reinforced teachers' sense of belonging and acceptance with the staff as a whole and departments in particular. The principal sponsored and engineered participation norms, and indirectly

stimulated coordinated and common orientations among departments. The administration enhanced a sense of specialness with its early recruitment policies; it tried to integrate new transferees into the school's operating mode. Most departments further enhanced teachers' sense of social and normative integration by the sharing of philosophies and teaching standards. Normative and social integration contributed to teachers "professionally" sharing of knowledge and skills.

Integration, as described above, is described primarily on the basis of interview analysis. When teachers spoke, they sounded like the "professional" teachers Peter Woods describes. However, the consistencies in rhetoric often contrasted with variety in performance. Some teachers worked extremely hard to engage students in relatively rigorous thinking activities, while others relied heavily on standard recitation and limited scope questions, while most students remained passive participants most of the hour. One of the teachers who sounded highly engaged in the interview taught in a friendly manner but did not seem to require very much of students. Also, the reader should not assume that because teachers at Cherry Glen focused mainly on content and skills instruction that all students at this school were required to demonstrate high levels of content knowledge or skill competencies. This varied across teachers, courses and ability levels of the same course.

Integrative task-related sharing characteristic of this school did contribute to greater certainty among teachers on curriculum, methods and activities. Integration was also a tool of standardization, most teachers recognizing that failure to conform with departmental content, grading, or methods expectations would bring peer disapproval and possibly unwanted administrative attention.

> You might deviate from a course outline. But that should not be a matter of habit, he should not be ignoring the curriculum guide we are obligated by contract to follow.... In our individual contract there is a paragraph that alludes to ...carrying out the duty or the assignment given. So, if I'm assigned to teach say an algebra class, the applied, the implication is that I will teach it as its described by this district.

Integration made a difference to the way teachers felt about their work, and to a lesser extent how they went about their work. A professional kind of engagement was expected and most teachers, through skills and content orientations and maintenance of school participation, maintained images that looked like

professional orientations to teaching. Integration provided both control over uncertainty and constraint on variable approaches to teaching.

Work Control at Cherry Glen

As other school research has discovered, much of the administrative control of teaching work at Cherry Glen was so taken for granted as not to be perceived as control by teachers. The administration completely controlled the formal allocation of time and money, and the sorting of students into classes. School policies lay beyond teachers' effective control. The engineering of policy consent through school improvement committees appeared to involve teachers in policy-making, though most teachers regarded many of the policy committees as administrative justifications for pre-decided policies. Teachers' involvement with policy making was one of the most disengaging aspects of the school. Despite the good intentions behind administrative desires to teacher policy involvement, the effects of overturning teacher recommendations caused teachers to want to distance themselves from policy committees and policy committee decisions.

> Yeah, they make the final decision. They ...tally the votes, you know. So they, they decide what, what our opinions were.

Teachers appreciated administrative control which buffered teachers from parent influences and which controlled problem student and teacher behaviors. The school administration buffered the teachers' curriculum and its implementation from most interference from powerful parent pressures. For this buffering to be effective, teachers had to follow the department curriculum, keep up with the variety of paper work required to justify grading (forms explaining how you grade students; forms reporting student progress or lack thereof), and the curriculum-in-use (copies of your weekly lesson plans), and meet administrative expectations for extra-classroom participation.

In teachers' discussions, extensive administrative paperwork requirements were a fair exchange for protection from unwanted parental interventions or necessary evils attending what at least some teachers regarded as good organizational practices by the administration.

> We complain a lot but I know many people who have taught elsewhere. Such as a simple thing as having a curriculum guide, that's something [Mr. Coyne] developed here in all departments. For a new teacher those were valuable. I can remember again going to [another high school in the area] and being told "Here's the book; teach it." "Yeah but when, how, what, what will I take from here?" "I don't know just do it." I'm sure there are still schools that operate that way.

Administrative delegation of some curriculum authority to teachers seemed to enhance teachers overall sense of work control. Even though time and student allocations lay beyond teachers' control, they could have an impact on curriculum materials through their department committees. Teachers regarded this control as significant. In departmental committees, teachers could decide the scope and sequence, texts to be used, the objectives of their departments, and the courses within departments. The school board and the administration supported this departmental curricular authority.

> I think if you're dealing with curriculum, yes. [The administration and the school board] are very good about implementing what we want and doing it the way we feel because we are after all the ones who are doing it.

Most teachers found district-supplied curriculum materials adequate.

> I think we're, we're reasonably well supplied. There are, we don't get absolutely everything we want.... Like anything else, if our budget, for all of our department exceeds what the school has been allocated, then we have to pare it down.... We get together as a department and say,'While we're willing to forego this, I don't want that to be cut out', and so on.

Within some departments, teachers felt that they could call on other teachers for curriculum materials, and teaching ideas. Particularly in some departments, this kind of sharing extended teaching resources which were completely controlled by the teachers themselves.

> We share lesson plans, we share experiences all the time. So our, the department knows very well what's going on in other people's classes ...because we talk to one another. I mean it, we even spend part of our department meetings sharing things that we think other people would like to know about.

Control of Instruction

Teachers were not free to teach anything they pleased to anyone they pleased. The school's central mission was the transmission of academic knowledge and skills, and the emphasis on these had been increasing recently, in response to national, state and parental pressures. Teachers or departments who were not conforming with these expectations could expect difficulty. There were many factors outside

teachers' control that shaped who and what they would teach. These included fluctuations due to increased academic requirements; the in-school expectations of content/skills orientations; expectations that departmental curriculum would be followed; course sequencing within departments; the stratification of students by ability into required courses ; the process of deciding who would teach what; the state requirements for certification, the number of certifications the individual possessed and that possessed by other individuals in the department; and the seniority and influence of particular individuals. Most of these factors matched teachers and students to available classes, in effect leaving teachers with narrow decision-making associated with teaching a particular class populated by particular kinds of students.

A few of those factors, like declining enrollment in the district, de-stabilized teaching expectations. Some individual teachers controlled the classes to which they were assigned through their use of seniority. Once senior teachers developed incumbency in upper level courses, they often remained teaching them as long as they chose to do so. Some form of incumbency for senior staff members seemed to be a dominant factor in scheduling in most departments. Some of the more senior members of departments could control unpredictable events (induced by scheduling complexities and fluctuations) by dropping certifications. By doing so, teachers could limit their teaching to one course, usually a required course that would be less subject to major enrollment fluctuations. This practice appeared to be a seniority privilege tolerated within departments and by the administration. While stabilizing the position of senior teachers, this practice also de-stabilized the control of younger teachers. Therefore, when senior department members reduced their certifications to subjects they preferred, junior members with multiple certifications often had to increase the number of their classroom preparations or quit teaching at the school.

Most external controls on teaching, however, seemed to stabilize teachers' notions of teaching, learning and students' abilities. They contributed to teachers ability to size up their students, match students to content and skills learning methods and evaluate student performance with relative confidence. Most teachers tended to classify students, curriculum and methods on the basis of experience with past groups of students.

> The average student tends to take American literature, the lower than average takes drama, that's just a common course that's not too difficult, and the brighter students take British and world literature.... Students who take advanced composition ...think that they're going on to school. Now, we have an intermediate comp for those kids who feel uncomfortable in writing at this stage, but would like to take advanced comp later on. And then we have an applied English, for those who think that they are not going on at all.

Direct teacher control over lessons came in the kinds of activities teachers chose, the choices they allowed their students, the order and frequency with which they chose particular activities, and the amount of material the covered. Predicting what would work with particular groups of students allowed teachers to control their classroom planning, and set the frequency and difficulty of student testing to maximize students' academic success.

This sense of control they experienced was reflected in their discussion of the process of teaching. The teacher in the first quotation discussed how the department taught research paper writing.

> Now what we're doing ...is have kids list everything under the sun that they are interested in, and we sit down in this advanced comp, and we pick out those subject areas where there could be a good research paper written, and let the kid choose from those subjects where he has a felt need to know something.
>
> With the advanced class I have a plan. Each day I'm able to pursue it ...without too many hang-ups and problems. And it also happens to be a group of students I worked with pretty closely last year.... Whereas I guess in the other classes, the first quarter of the year, you go through a feeling-out process. And it seems like as the year goes on, you learn what you can do, and what you can't do.

Control of rewards

Teachers' ability to predict and control the intrinsic rewards of teaching is a major part of their ability to control their work and a critical part of their continuing engagement with their work (Lortie, 1975, Kottcamp, et. al., 1986). Most teachers at Cherry Glen seemed to find intrinsic rewards readily available in their daily work, and many felt almost single-handedly responsible for those rewards. The sources of teaching rewards were unique, but all reflected a sense that teachers had reached students in some concrete way. Some teachers obtained rewards from the success of classroom learning experiences:

> I: What was the best thing that happened last week?
> T: Last week would have to be the successes of students on a test, or, or a quiz situation. I put my heart and soul in that, and when they do well, you know, I'm happy, I'm pleased.

> In the business world, if a person was motivated, he or she was always rewarded with monetary things, or with promotions, and ...we obviously do not have the same structure. You know, I think you have to reap your satisfaction as a teacher from doing other things, you know, from, from knowing that the lesson was well taught, from, just from very little, little strokes.

Two teachers felt successful with the students this year but expressed how much difference a particular group of students could make to their sense of accomplishment:

> when I taught the class to freshmen, sometimes I felt like I was beating my head against the wall, because a lot of kids didn't want to learn. But this year with kids I've got, it makes it so easy, and you move along so fast, because they do have a very broad knowledge of the subject, I think.

> ...because it's the nature of the class and the student that you get.... In fifth hour you know you can toss a coin sometimes what's going to be successful for you, so it really depends on the kids that you get.

Another discussed how his engagement with teaching was related to his collegial contacts, especially within his department.

> I like the fact that I feel good about being a teacher because I think most teachers are pretty well-informed people.... Most of the people that I work with have at least Masters' degrees, and I see they're real conscientious. I see them here in the morning when I come, and many times people are here after I leave.

While intrinsic rewards like collegial contact and the successful "reaching" of students were normally available to most Cherry Glen teachers, many were also troubled by their lack of status, the lack of remuneration in teaching and the lack of information that their services were valued by society.

> I think that in the last ten years or so, I have said to myself, I don't know who this little man is inside of me that keeps telling me to say this to myself, "You're worth a lot of money, and you've never gotten it, and you're going to retire poor, and that's not fair." Now, there's somebody inside of me who's not been happy about this, in spite of the fact that, you know, I love teaching and I appreciate what kinds of rewards there are, there's somebody inside me who's very resentful.

Despite such resentments, most teachers had no immediate plans to leave teaching, no immediate plans to change their level of involvement, commitment or expenditure of energy. The things that gave them some of their most precious and predictable rewards-their success with students and their collegial relations with peers-did not prevent them from wondering if teaching was all they should or could do.

Normative and Social Integration, Work Control and Engagement: Professional Careers at Cherry Glen

Despite the numerous mostly indirect controls on their teaching, most Cherry Glen teachers felt they had the ability and opportunity to control their teaching work, particularly the intrinsic rewards of the work. Norms of continuous technical improvement and participation and belonging through task-related associations reinforced each other and teachers' sense of work control to produce high levels of involvement, commitment and absorption in the tasks of teaching. The norms which infused the social relations supported teacher group and individual commitments to content and skills teaching. While the principal formally engineered participation, involvement and commitment, the teachers engineered the curriculum in a sphere demarcated by the administration. The highly bounded world of the school provided uncertainty control, and encouraged a narrow but high range of "professional" engagement. Yet, the boundaries also limited the extent of individual creativity in ways that the other school discussed later in this paper did not.

Apart from questions of who controlled resources, at this school resources for teaching were available and most teachers had found ways in which to produce successful processes and outcomes with students of varying abilities. The resources of time, materials and students were either adequate or generous, according to most teachers. Stability in student and teacher assignments allowed teachers to use activities which had worked in the past, refining the details of execution. Subject departments, through administrative delegation, became mechanisms for indirect teacher group curriculum influence and control. Teachers participated willingly in curriculum work, despite the extra time involved and their loss of some individual autonomy vis-á-vis their peers. Once departments formed the standards and ordered the materials, their teachers generally followed them. Following the curriculum, teachers protected themselves from parent interventions, and gained a sense of legitimacy, confidence and control in overcoming some of the endemic uncertainties which accompanies most school teaching. Not all uncertainty was dispatched, and teachers' sense of control was not complete, but it was substantial.

Despite individual teachers' lack of control in some areas, most teachers did not express powerlessness about these built-in constraints of the work place. Part of the reason might have been that

most of what was beyond the control of teachers was working so well it seemed invisible. Part of the reason for this might also have been that larger school normative patterns, focused through and enhanced by work-focused departmental relationships and norms, gave teachers a sense of belonging to a community which made objective constraints seem insignificant to teachers. Perhaps, having internalized the norms upon which the school was based, teachers were not aware of the large number of controls on the framing of their work.

In general, teachers at Cherry Glen seemed highly absorbed and involved in the subject/skills teaching which formed the substance of a form of "professional" teaching engagement. Teachers in most of the departments we had contact with seemed to have built networks of technical assistance, and support which they regarded as enhancements to their teaching performance. The absorption in work continued to their preparation during and outside the school day.

I: Does anyone beside the students know what you do in the classroom?
T: No.
I: No?
T: [Teacher discusses how he was evaluated this year by an assistant principal who was a former student of his] ....Other than that, I guess after teaching here for twenty-five years, maybe they respect me as a teacher. I don't know. I hope they do, but ...there are years go by that nobody ever comes in.

Normative and Social Integration at Pinehill

Like teachers at Cherry Glen, Pinehill teachers felt that they belonged to a school community, but the Pinehill community was less administratively engineered and looser than Cherry Glen. At Pinehill, the lack of strong administratively orchestrated integrative pressures had at least two observable effects. First, the Pinehill staff exhibited much greater variety in their engagement orientations than their counterparts at Cherry Glen. Second, the absence of an active role for departments allowed teachers' attachments to non-department and non-school groups, some of which co-existed with the school. Third, some of these groups supported moderate engagement, while others supported lower engagement, levels.

The staff community was loosely unified by normative integration around "camaraderie," the toleration of idiosyncrasy and acceptance of administrative proscriptions regarding order and student failures. The administration encouraged these norms; the principal was a major influence on the maintenance of the general integrative tone. Camaraderie, idiosyncrasy and minimal proscriptions at Pinehill encouraged little of the departmental technical sharing, curriculum conformity and homogeneity of engagement orientation so prevalent at Cherry Glen. Cherry Glen's school-wide norms encouraged a school-wide "professional" orientation. However, at Pinehill women's group norms supported mainly vocational orientations to teaching (expression of one's true identity, or as a mission to care for students' needs), while men supported continuance engagement orientations (minimal affect role adherence with instrumental dimensions).

Camaraderie and common experience

Pinehill teachers described camaraderie as the general good feeling teachers associated with being with each other in school, their belief that teachers were willing to help each other out when necessary, and the familiarity that comes from years of association with each other.

> I, I feel really quite comfortable about the general camaraderie, the general person to person support. Granted, more between some people than others, but I think there's a general positive feeling about each other.

> I think we've all been together so long that everybody knows what everybody else is like and you can talk about anything around here and often times people do.

Teachers contributed to camaraderie through their active and passive participation in the annual Christmas party. The annual Christmas party (held in early spring due to the importance of maximizing participation) was a major school-wide social event for teachers. Considerable advance planning, meetings and individual efforts went into making the party successful. Most teachers regarded the event as a renewal of the general acceptance teachers afforded each other. Camaraderie implied a flat acceptance in the community regardless of one's teaching subject, and one's ability or desire to teach.

The principal, Mr. Taylor, was an active force in the maintenance of camaraderie. He had grown up in neighboring Millerton with many of the senior teachers. He maintained personal contacts outside school with many of them. However, Mr. Taylor did more than maintain old friendships. He often circulated through the halls, classrooms and department meetings, greeting students and teachers, showing genuine interest in what they were doing. He also praised and thanked teachers for doing special activities with students. Furthermore, Mr. Taylor often worked to find the means for teachers to begin new courses, and special projects for students. In these ways, Mr. Taylor established personal commitments with individual teachers, helped individual teachers to remain involved and established trust with many teachers, and thus positively influenced their engagement. Teachers tended to identify with Mr. Taylor as one of them, someone who understood teachers' lives, who was accessible and willing to help them out where he could.

Idiosyncrasy

Idiosyncrasy among staff members at Pinehill, closely related to camaraderie, was tolerated on the school and departmental level to a degree the Cherry Glen staff probably would never have allowed. Usually, idiosyncrasy took the form of the administration allowing teachers to have broad de facto discretion over what they taught and how they taught it. None of the administrative personnel seemed willing to intervene in cases where it became obvious that teachers were disregarding the department curriculum. The administration also tolerated idiosyncratic practices through their infrequent formal evaluation. Teachers tolerated idiosyncrasy within their departments by ignoring widely divergent practices and failing to sanction departures from the formal curriculum. Idiosyncrasy had historical dimensions, in that most of the teachers interviewed entered their teaching jobs at this school with little more guidance than an existing textbook and a classroom in which to teach. The early socialization of new recruits contributed to individualized approaches to teaching. Over time, teachers and small groups of teachers had developed their own approaches to curriculum and instruction.

Idiosyncrasy had two obvious effects on engagement. First, it undercut the security Cherry Glen teachers experienced through the establishment of common educational standards by which teachers could measure their success relative to other teachers in teaching content and skills to students. Second, idiosyncrasy allowed scope for innovation while the Cherry Glen curriculum constrained innovation through its insistence on departmental consensus.

The twin proscriptions

Most Pinehill teachers did not see any "educational" direction in which the school was heading. The following was a typical response to a question on the topic.

> I don't really think so. I really don't.... There isn't. I don't know that the school has a general direction, other than, you know, general education, like any other school.

However, indirectly teacher behavior was directed and bounded by the twin teacher obligations of not sending too many students to the office and not failing too many students. At Cherry Glen, the reader will recall, not following the curriculum could get teachers into trouble. At Pinehill, violating either of the

twin proscriptions against excessive dismissal or excessive failing grades could get a teacher into trouble with parents, trouble with administrators, bring peer disapproval or all three.

> Flunking a lot of kids gets some people into difficulties. I mean, flunking large numbers of kids...I would guess that the other thing that would get a teacher into trouble is having discipline problems, not being able to handle your own classroom discipline situations constantly.

According to many teachers, the twin proscriptions probably satisfied community expectations, by maximizing course passage at the expense of "education."

> Cause if it [the school] was run the way we [administrators and teachers] wanted it to be, the school would probably have three or four hundred less kids, and there'd be much more education going on.

On the school level, norms of camaraderie, the two proscriptions and acceptance of idiosyncrasy loosely linked teachers to each other and to the administration. Camaraderie and acceptance of idiosyncrasy allowed personal loyalties and personal (sometimes innovative) and gender-related approaches to teaching, while posing obstacles to common approaches to curriculum and pedagogy. The toleration of idiosyncrasy, the twin proscriptions, and camaraderie reinforced each other. Overall, teachers said that they were doing what they thought the community would allow, and what would keep them in good standing with the administration and, to a lesser extent, their peers.

Gender group social integration and teaching norms

While the school provided a set of general norms which connected teachers loosely to the school, gender groups and gender relationships inside and outside of school influenced the amount and nature of teacher engagement as well as teachers' instructional goals. Informal gender relations influenced teachers' conversations, teachers' associations, and the instructional goals and, to a lesser extent, practices most favored. The teachers lounge, during the lunch hours, was the most obvious place to observe the separate physical and social worlds of men and women teachers. Interviews further reflected separate social support systems available to teachers of both sexes.

Men's modal relations, norms and career engagement

In the lounge during lunch, men all sat at smaller tables to one side of the lounge, most playing card games. Some men played cards during their preparation periods. While playing cards, men did not usually talk about students, curriculum or school in general.

> [One female noted] It is rare to find men talking about students. You listen to the men down there. They talk sports, usually they talk sports. The men in the faculty room don't do it. I will talk with some of the men about educational things, but you get them together and that is not a subject they want to discuss.

According to one teacher, card playing linked men to after-school primarily male social contacts which also promoted non-school related social activities and conversations.

> And I socialize with a group outside of school. You know there's a group of us here that fish and hunt with a couple of guys, and play golf with a bunch...Guys will stop, and some of the gals will stop by and bowl on the Tuesday nights with the teachers' bowling league, so you know I, once, twice a month we bowl.

Even outside of lounge card-playing circles, many men considered in-school discussion of teaching in the presence of other men undesirable. One man was asked about whether he would like to or would find it helpful to discuss curriculum, treatment of students or methods with other apparently male teachers:

> Oh, I think that at least there is some talking shop, but I think most people are glad to get away from shop talk, and ...get talking about [the local professional basketball team, or the football team] ...you know, going fishing, or things other than teaching.

Discussion of teaching outside school was definitely considered inappropriate for men. One man remarked that "I've never taken my briefcase home to the family." Essentially, men's gender groups remained intact in and out of school, colonizing the school's space and time with non-teaching discussion.

Men's outside time commitment to teaching was minimal compared to most of the women and most of the Cherry Glen teachers. Most of the men put in little or no time outside of school hours. One of the

men said he worked between fifteen and twenty hours extra in a typical week, outdistancing his nearest male competitor by 15 hours.

Most men spoke of their teaching career in terms of continuance, though one man expressed elements of a professional outlook and another expressed orientations toward professional, vocational and continuance engagements. Many males viewed their career in teaching in terms of investments and sacrifices that had committed them to continuing in teaching; and a calculation of costs and benefits, in which the benefits slightly outweighed the costs. Their sacrifices had become irretrievable personal investments, or what Becker (1960) would call "side bets." Most of the senior men referred to having to have taken second jobs in the summer and some during the school year to make ends meet, or save for their children's educations. Some referred to the sacrifice they made in terms of social status.

> All-in-all, I guess I'm trapped. I probably like mostly what I'm doing. I don't know what, if I'll be able to take it, when I finally decide to retire. I'm going to, I'll have to work hard to find ways to fill my day.... The lack of esteem that people have for me.... Yeah. I have thought of leaving teaching ...partly because of the financial reasons, and again, the esteem ideas, that I would like to show people that I can do all those things that they do.

Among many males, there was a sense that they had reached what they believed was a comfort level associated with their sense of competence in handling the demands of teaching. The comfort level entailed a low involvement, and a familiarity or sense of competence one might get from doing the same thing over a long period of time.

> I'm not talking about doing handsprings and cartwheels and "yeah, I really enjoy this," but enough where you can get up every morning and go to work and not worry about taking high blood pressure pills or you know.... I can't take this any longer'. Well, I, that's how I perceive myself. I can do this job.

Thus, most men referred to continuing to teach, despite their self-acknowledged lack of involvement and interest in classroom teaching. Several hoped that they would be able to retire soon.

> No, no, you're not going to have to kick me out when it comes to retirement, because I frankly think that I'm going to retire as early as I can, simply because I think I am experiencing, not classic teacher burnout, but I don't know that I'm as effective as I used to be. I don't know that I've got the energy that I once had. But when I see it's time that I can afford to leave, I'm going to retire, so I can very well retire at fifty-eight.

Men's relations not only supported modal continuance career orientations but also instructional goals which combined an inculcation of values and a preparation for adulthood. Many men tried to inculcate

in students' behaviors which would carry over to "real life" situations. Obedience to superiors, persistence in the face of difficulty, completion of work, promptness, attendance, and some form of paying attention to others were important to most of the men teachers. Content and skills teaching were considered important additions to lessons for the upper ability students. Many men depreciated and some openly questioned, the value of content and skills instruction for average and below average students, and doubted that absorption in classroom teaching would make much difference to students. In doing so, some expressed resistance toward a professional orientation associated with content/skills instruction.

> Attitudes. Forget about content, because they're going to forget about it fifteen minutes after June 10th, they're going to forget ninety percent of it anyway.... I think I'm trying to teach them how to be better people within, within a group. How to get along with other people.
>
> I'm not terribly convinced that subject matter is all what it's cracked up to be. That, because, you know, my lesson today on, I think went relatively well, ...but I don't know that five years from now, anybody's going to remember what I taught them ...today. But if they show some interest today in [the subject of the lesson] and carry through a little bit with it, they maybe start to vote a little bit as a result of what I've said, and then I can, and then I think I've accomplished what I've, you know, what I want.

Since teachers had to meet the demands of the twin proscriptions, teachers had to find ways to entice students to cooperate with instruction without actually holding the most reluctant responsible (in terms of evaluation and grading) for subject or skill competence. Systems usually relied on attendance and tardiness formulas with strong emphasis on student completion of assignments in or out of class. Two of the men openly contracted with students: they guaranteed passing grades in return for good student behavior. Some of the teachers and most of the men teachers rewarded students with socializing time at the end of every period if the class had remained on task. One of the three males most integrated into the male group tried to insure high pass rates and high levels of cooperation by rarely expecting students to read, write or remember the content in his lower-ability classes.

Two of the men teachers did not fit the above pattern tightly. One of the men teachers whom we interviewed and spent the day was not a lounge card player, and did not eat in the lounge. This teacher used grading systems like that in other men's classrooms, but he had a different feeling about his work. He showed enthusiasm for, even love of, his subject and he emphasized skill development. He also displayed a

desire to rescue alienated students from school failure. All of this was supported by sustenance he obtained from outside groups and persons. Despite his marginal attachment to the model gender norms and relations and his recognition that his ideas were quite different from those of other staff, this teacher managed to maintain a high level of involvement in his classroom instruction. One other man, who had created his own courses, showed greater than average interest in the subjects and the skills his students learned.

Women's model relations and instructional norms

Among women teachers, discussion of teaching, among other topics, was appropriate in and out of school. Most women talked about teaching with individuals inside and outside of school. Outside of school, they talked about it with their husbands, close friends and relatives. Unlike most men, most women did not associate with each other outside the school day. The apparent in-school sources of women's common instructional norms were across-department networks, and dyadic relationships within and across departments. If they were married, women generally went home to their families.

During the lunch hour, women occupied a large table in the center of the lounge, and discussed a broad range of topics.

> About everything. We'll talk about kids at lunch, or if somebody had a bad day, or you know, some kid was terrible, or your class was really great, or everybody passed your test for a change. Those kinds of things are talked about at lunch.

Even among the women, large group discussion of content or skills was rare. More commonly, women would share information about problem students. One woman observed that there was a network of women who provided in-school counseling, support and encouragement for other women in their attempts to meet the social and emotional needs of students.

> You know ...this group of women is kind of a quiet thing. It's not a forceful, it's not "I'm the boss".... It's kind of a quiet, I don't even want to say 'movement', that's too strong of a word. A feeling. It's really nice to get together at lunch and say, "Hey, look, I have this kid,".... "What do you think? What should I do?". You know, and they'll all kind of work together, if they know a kid's having a problem: "Oh, I have him in this class. I'll see what I can do."

In general, women seemed more committed to teaching than did men at Pinehill. All of three of the women whom we observed and interviewed at length expressed levels of commitment which exceeded that

of the majority of the other teachers at Pinehill and the majority at Cherry Glen. Women averaged twice as much time outside school on teaching work as men, including the man with the extra 15-20 hours a week. Being single seemed to boost outside time commitment for both schools. However, both of the married women significantly more or their non-school time on school work than any of the married males.

Many women shared a vocational orientation toward their teaching engagement. Some women shared a perception that teaching was suited to their personal identity. Others expressed a missionary zeal to meet the emotional and social needs of their most alienated students. One of the females who had contemplated leaving high school teaching described her increasing attraction to teaching at the college level.

> I've never been able to see that I could do anything else that I would enjoy as much as I do teaching. I've just never been able to see it. Now, maybe if I found something that I thought I would enjoy, if I could get into a field where I was involved in writing, preparing textbooks, giving lectures, assisting education in some way, that perhaps I could go for.... It is not just a job. Teaching is not just a job. It is a way of life. It is an attitude. It is part of our national growth. So it, it isn't just a job.

Women were more likely than men to value and engage themselves in some form of content and skills instruction. Also, women teachers were more likely to express and become engaged with eclectic instructional goals: a content or skills acquisition orientation combined with "caring," or socialization for adulthood goals (like those men listed above). One woman teacher linked the improvement of a student's self-esteem to student establishment of good work habits; and the teacher connected good habits with academic learning:

> Kind of take somebody under your wing, and make certain that they turn things in, and make them feel like they are important and that it matters that they get their work turned in, and just make them, some of the kids don't have much of a self-image, and I guess to help improve that self-image.

> The doing homework and the learning to be punctual and learning to take responsibility, and turn things in. That kind of thing that goes right along with ...the subject matter.... [I] don't want to say it's more important, but I think it's just as important as knowing something about [the subject].

In general, women's instructional goals differed from men's in two respects. First, among women, goals were more likely to be eclectic combinations than men's more consistent focus on adult socialization of stu-

dents. Secondly, women tended to include content and skills instruction as an important element of their goals.

Especially among women, dyads provided an outlet for those who wanted to discuss curriculum issues or trade techniques. None of the males we observed all day mentioned similar dyadic relations. One of the two women most concerned with content and skills also drew support from association at a local university. Both who were most concerned about content relied on dyads rather than the lounge group for sustenance in school. Both thought they had the principal's support for their goals.

Both men and women teachers seemed to feel that the public did not appreciate their work. For women, this fact seemed less important than the intrinsic rewards of engaged teaching. Among women, there was little of the calculative cost-benefit analysis common to men's discussions of staying in teaching.

> I basically, like, I do enjoy teaching. I would not say to you, well I wish I could be doing something else or something.... This is not an easy job. This is a very difficult job. It's a very time consuming job. It's a very draining job. You have to give. When you are in front of a classroom, you have to really work to try to get them to all pay attention and do things and you have to keep being enthused and it's very, very tiring. It's also very, very enjoyable. Otherwise, we wouldn't be doing it, but I don't know. I guess that's it. They [the public] think we have it easy. It may appear easy, like a kid will say, "you get paid for this. This is so easy." Oh, boy, if they only knew!

Summary: Integration at Pinehill High School

School-wide norms of general acceptance, along with Mr. Taylor's efforts to build informal and personal relations between himself and teachers provided teachers with a basis for sociability and broad acceptance within the school. Not only the principal, but also the teachers contributed to social integration on the school level through social event(s) and through the acceptance of idiosyncrasy and the twin minimal proscriptions. However, these norms, unlike those at Cherry Glen, contributed little to the development of task-based staff relations.

Differences between the genders shaped patterns of relationships and communication rules, influenced the extent and nature of engagement in teaching, and affected the primacy of educational goals and practices. Women's norms and relations reinforced a vocational engagement with teaching. Women held teaching goals that emphasized both perceived student needs and other educational goals, including academic content/skills acquisition. Men's norms and relations minimized commitment to the teaching role,

supported a continuance perspective and minimized or denied the value of content or skills teaching. Men's norms and relations influenced most males to concentrate almost exclusively on the inculcation of values men thought would be useful to students after graduation, such as obedience, and work completion. Finally, the most engaged men and women teachers at this school, especially those most involved in content/skills instruction, were most isolated from most of their peers.

Work Control At Pinehill High School

Control of Instruction

Compared to Cherry Glen teachers, teachers at Pinehill enjoyed considerably more autonomy over their classroom work. Unrestrained by effective collegial or administrative pressures to adhere to a department curriculum, teachers at Pinehill felt free to adopt curricula-in-use and methods which suited their dispositions. Little in the way of formal policies, departmental prerogatives, inadequate resources, internal or external pressures stood in the way of teachers' classroom control. The toleration of idiosyncrasy, and the administrative tendency to personalized management contributed to maximizing individual teacher control over the curriculum in use. Some content and skills-oriented teachers used this autonomy to develop inventive classroom approaches to content or skills teaching or both. Other teachers used the autonomy to fend off unwanted pressures from peers, parents or administrators.

Unlike Cherry Glen teachers, men and women at Pinehill High School were not required to participate in time-consuming extracurricular activities or student supervision (beyond standing in hallways between classes). Unlike Cherry Glen teachers, Pinehill teachers were not required to submit formal explanations of grading policies. Unlike the Cherry Glen curriculum control process, the Pinehill curriculum-in-use was what individual teachers decided it would be.

> We spent all the last year and a half laying out this [subject] curriculum and what everybody is going to teach, and it's all typed out. So teachers got paid during the summer to do this. [When] day one starts, you do what you want to do. That's it. You do what you want to do. It's set on paper, ok?.... I don't know if that [the written curriculum] really represents what's being done in the classroom.

Three of the male teachers said that they could be teaching a completely different subject for a long time before anyone would notice.

> You know, if I wanted to teach anything, you know, if I had a concept ...that didn't fit, I could teach anything I wanted. Basically, and as long as you don't send people to the office, as long as we control our classrooms, as long as we don't have parents on our back, rocking the boat, we do what we want.

Many of the taken-for-granted influences on teachers ultimate classroom instructional control operating at Cherry Glen operated at Pinehill, however. Administratively determined ability grouping of students, assignment of teacher to particular classes, and state certification requirements were examples of such influences.

Like the Cherry Glen teachers, most Pinehill teachers believed that little the administration or other teachers did interfered with their ability to control instruction. However, most Pinehill teachers, like their counterparts at Cherry Glen, preferred stable groupings of students. Most felt that with such groups they could anticipate what kinds of activities and materials would work best with particular classes. They therefore sensed no constraint in administratively determined ability grouping. Many Pinehill required subjects at Pinehill were more ability-differentiated than similar courses at Cherry Glen. As at Cherry Glen, most Pinehill teachers felt that the allocation of students and teachers to specific classes was based on rational, fair and complex guidelines. Pinehill teachers were not asked to participate in the discussion of school policies, but few could identify any school policies that affected their teaching. Like Cherry Glen, most teachers felt that the administration would protect them against parent interventions unless teachers violated the twin proscriptions.

The main source of external control on instruction at Pinehill was the highly sorted nature of the student body, a pattern that had been more marked in the past. The sorting of students into higher and lower abilities affected teachers' assessments of what they could do or were willing to do in the classroom. Most teachers stated ways in which they could successfully plan and teach classes composed of either upper or lower ability sorted students. Five teachers said that they had found activities that they thought worked well with high ability groups and other activities that worked better with low ability groups. In general, the activities for low ability groups were limited to basic skills and inculcation of values like deference to

authority, promptness and "listening skills." In upper ability groups, teachers' activities were designed to promote content acquisition, synthetic and analytic thinking and writing skills, and coping with complex issues. Two teachers developed instructional models that fit their upper ability classes then applied diminished versions to their lower-ability classes.

> I don't know if watered down is the right word. More explanation would be a better word than watered down. I spend more time, make it simpler, use simpler language, you know, trying to get down to their level. Now that some people say bring them up to your level rather than go down to theirs, but ...if they can hardly talk or write, how are they going to come up to my level, hmm? Just can't do it. So with the better classes, I will use a higher level presentation. Higher level vocabulary, whereas when I get down to these kids, they can't understand that. So then I have to water down the way I talk to them.

Most Cherry Glen teachers found their upper ability level classes easy to control. At Pinehill, most teachers preferred teaching the upper ability-sorted groups, though five of the eight teachers we observed and interviewed at length commented that upper-ability groups could be difficult to control.

> T: I don't know if I could stand five hours of honors.
> I: Because?
> T: They're nice because their assignments are done, and that kind of thing, but sometimes they can be trying.... They're a little more vocal you get ones like the ones you saw in there that, you know, act up.

Two of the five teachers were ambivalent about the extra preparation required to teach upper ability classes. One teacher pointed out how difficult it was for him to find adequate materials to match their interests and skills:

> [I] have to reach back and find exercises and activities that will help the kids cause they're so, they're so ...high to start with. If, if you're talking, if your, if your question is "what do I find most difficult to achieve my goals?".... I would say it would be the high level classes. I'm not accustomed to having them.

Only one of the teachers with higher ability students felt that she could control the rewards she expected from teaching this level with certainty. She had personally designed many activities that made upper ability students participate in class, use writing and thinking skills and learn the course content.

At least six out of the eight teachers who had or were presently working with lower ability students had found methods they regarded as successful. Teachers spoke of setting standards which lower-ability students could reach, if students made reasonable efforts. For example, one teacher commented that students felt joy in learning how to write a paragraph. This pattern extended to other teachers, most of

whom thought that they could plan activities that would make students learn something , and that something they considered worthwhile.

Most teachers, especially the men, preferred high and low sorted student classes to average or un-sorted classes.

> [A teacher talks about difficulty in teaching heterogeneous average classes] So who do you talk to? You talk to kids on the bottom, and the kids on the top sit there and say, "Oh, my god, look at this". You talk to the kids on the top and the kids on the bottom sit there, they don't know what you're talking about. Those are the hardest classes to relate to ...because of the wide range of intellect in the classroom. Whereas that third and eighth hour class, they're all in the ninetieth percentile. I know who I'm talking to there.

Control of rewards-gender differences

The ability or willingness of teachers to reach students was gender-related. Many men found intrinsic rewards in teaching harder to acquire than did women, especially in their average and lower ability classes. Most of the women were able to find rewards in most of the classes they taught, though all three found it difficult to reach many individual students in their lowest ability classes. It seems not all of the difficulty that teachers experienced in reaching students lay in the characteristics of the students. It seems likely much lay in the perceptions of the teachers, because the difficulty differed according to the teachers' gender.

Four men teachers we observed and interviewed at length claimed that a large percentage (thirty to forty percent) of their average and lower-ability students were overly passive, disinterested in, or resistant or hostile to classroom learning. These men said they preferred highly verbal to silent students, yet often their conduct of lessons seemed to elicit passive participation from students.

Many of the men we interviewed seemed to believe that student passivity was due to factors beyond their control. One teacher attributed the passivity of thirty to forty percent of his students to society's devaluation of education; this devaluation, he concluded, was evident in student attitudes toward teacher-directed classroom instruction.

> I would be explaining something to them up in front of the class, and she would be turning around talking to her friend about her date last night, and when I'd say, "Ok, uh, Susie, pay attention", she'd turn around and in, in effect, say, "Don't bother me with your ...education bit. I'm more interested about what happened last night". And that's the attitude.

According to another male, passivity was partly due to students' being unable or unwilling or both.

> ...the slower classes, they can't talk. Or they don't want to talk, or they don't know what to talk about. So sometimes they just sit there, and oh my god, hurry up, clock. And I'm thinking the same thing, let's get out of there and get it over with.

He described teaching these students as like talking to a "wall." By contrast, he felt that higher ability classes contained natural participators:

> Yep. Those are the kids who are not only intellectually smarter, those are all the kids who are on the basketball team, and of course, you were in here yesterday, those are all the cheerleaders, the pom-pon girls, the debaters, the forensic kids. They're involved in school.

Another male teacher guessed that student passivity might be due to the lack of blue collar parent interest in their education.

Three of the five men teachers we observed all day controlled potential failures and disruptive behaviors of average and below average students through negotiation. Negotiation consisted of contracting with students by offering them few work requirements and getting non-disruptive classroom behavior and regular completion of required assignments in return. Students fulfilling their part of the bargain would pass, and those who did not might fail unless they were bright enough to do well on tests. Four of the five males observed all day made classroom participation including tardiness or attendance or both, work sheets and other written assignments major components of their grades. Practices like this de-emphasized the importance of student test and quiz grades, and therefore the importance of subject and skills instruction. One teacher told us he announced to a class of lower ability sorted students the first day of the semester:

> ...you do these work sheets, you pay attention to me in class, everybody in here gets a "C". A few of you, I'm going to give a "B" to, because we've got some projects coming up" [he went on to say that students who did not do these things would get F's, and that students who participated in the blood drive would get B's; he did not say if there was any way students could get A's].

Women teachers did not discuss any ways in which they negotiated grades for compliance. In most of the three women's classes regardless of ability, many activities required active student participation. Teachers pressed students harder and allowed less student off-task time. Two of the three women teachers we observed and interviewed at length said that only their lowest ability classes had large numbers of

passive and difficult to motivate students. Nonetheless, most women felt that students' presentation of apparent passivity and disinterest required extra teacher effort to reach students. They did not see a need for teacher resignation or negotiation on teachers' parts.

> So, a year or so ago, I would have been ready to give up the [lower ability] class, but there are times when, as with this group, they're a challenge, because I want to see how many of them can succeed, and that becomes a challenge, and when they get something, they're so overjoyed that it becomes a real thrill to teach them, because they begin to feel very positive. And it is a place, it takes a different kind of a preparation and classroom activity. The others, you have to, you have to, for the other high classes, it's, it's the intellectual challenge with the material, and getting them to try to do their best. With these people, it's trying to find a way to tap their interests, so that they can open themselves up to learning, which is a whole different thing. So that's kind of interesting.

Teachers at Pinehill responded to lower and average ability students in gender-specific ways. These ways reflected teachers' subjective perspectives on the inherent capabilities of students. Some saw these as lying within, and some saw them as lying outside, their instructional control. Men were more likely to assign fixed characteristics to average and below average classes. Once having assigned unteachable labels to classes of students, such teachers rejected the possibility that they could reach these students. Women teachers, while recognizing apparent student passivity in their lowest ability classes, were more likely to regard passivity as a symptom or a changeable condition, not a situation beyond their control. These women were able to find some ways in which they could reach at least some of these students. Administrative allocation of students was only one part of work control. Gender groups influenced the very manner in which teachers defined students' abilities and desire to learn, and so consequently influenced their belief in their own ability to reach students.

Social Integration, Work Control and Engagement at Pinehill: Differentiated Engagement

Engagement at Pinehill varied widely, much more widely than at Cherry Glen. Normative and social relations promoted differential teaching engagement. Instead of supporting professional engagement, sub-groups supported either vocational or continuance kinds of engagement. Some teachers used the large amount of autonomy to develop highly creative learning experiences for students, while others used the same autonomy to limit engagement to little more than what the administration required.

The administration and colleague groups at Pinehill High School exerted few formal pressures on teachers' classroom work. Most teachers found teaching materials and time adequate. Teachers found the allocation of upper and lower ability classes fair. The administration infrequently supervised teachers, and did not require that teachers follow departmental curricula. There were no regular faculty meetings, and few other teacher meetings, and few formal reporting requirements. In the place of formal and authoritative policies and chains of policy delegation, the administration relied on personal contacts between the principal and individual teachers and on department chairs as two-way transmitters of information and commands.

Norms of camaraderie, toleration of idiosyncrasy, and the twin proscriptions gave a general sense of belonging that was loosely related to the tasks of teaching. At Pinehill High School, teachers could be members of the staff by adhering to minimal common norms and rules. Teachers could be accepted if they did not violate the twin proscriptions, threaten to ruin camaraderie, or impose their teaching goals on others.

Gender groups integrated teachers in more powerful ways, either strengthening or weakening commitment to types of teaching engagement through gender-relevant norms, social networks and instructional control practices. Men's group norms and relationships colonized the school's social and physical spaces, socializing men into non-school-related activities. Women's group norms and relations integrated women into school-related and school-relevant activities. Subject/skills-engaged teachers found themselves on the margins of both the school gender groups, though a woman on the margin could find single confidents with whom to share mutual teaching interests. Many men interpreted student resources differently than women did. Most men felt that they had little control over learning outcomes with average and below-average classes. Women, while regarding their lowest ability classes as difficult to engage, mostly felt that they could make small gains with extraordinary exertions.

Gender group membership was strongly correlated with the level of engagement in teaching. Among the men, lower levels of involvement, time and emotional investment and effort were common. By contrast, women committed themselves to much more time outside the school day in lesson preparation and correction of student work. Time commitments arose out of gender norms. Male norms reinforced the

belief that teaching was a job that occurred between specific hours, and was not to be brought into the rest of one's life. Female norms reinforced the belief that teaching was a vocation involving a commitment to extra preparation outside of the classroom and the school.

CONTRASTING INFLUENCES ON THE LEVELS AND KINDS OF ENGAGEMENT AND SOME IMPLICATIONS FOR REFORM

The findings of this paper do not support reform proposals that would call for using universal increases in either work control or social integration as levers to increase teachers' engagement in all schools. The findings do support reforms which take into account the complexities of actual school relationships, the complexity of engagement and the complex, interactive nature of school integration and work control.

Teaching engagement is itself complex. It includes involvement, commitment and absorption in both goal orientations and career orientations. Individual teachers can be committed to one or more goals, and one or more career orientations. Within particular schools, teaching career orientations may be either fairly homogeneous or differentiated.

Normative and social integration interact with each other. School leadership, social networks and linkages are the sources of norms, but expectations about school participation, classroom instruction and other matters can define the boundaries of groups and influence in or out of school interaction or both. For example, in Cherry Glen, teachers most frequently associated with and identified with other department members; department members shared common ideas of teaching and participation with each other. In Pinehill, outside of classroom men most often associated with other men; men most often discussed non-teaching subjects and shared common expectations that teaching consists of transmission of values and socialization of students for adult occupations. Norms affected group formation and groups affected norms.

Schools can be integrated in different ways, since normative and social integration interact. If normative integration centers on subject/skills, task-involvement, and curriculum, as at Cherry Glen, enhanced social integration may lead to greater teacher engagement in the teaching of subjects/skills. If normative integration is focused on sharing interests unrelated to work or distancing teachers from work,

as it was at Pinehill, increased social integration may lead to continuance orientations and a lack of engagement in the teaching task. At both schools, there was variance in orientation, but Pinehill seemed to sponsor greater variety in teaching orientations and teaching goals. It may not be how much employees are socially integrated but the kind of normative integration that operates in the school that establishes both a level of engagement and a type of engagement.

Control arrangements in the two schools reported here seem to have particular benefits but also costs. In a school like Cherry Glen, where administratively-backed departmental curriculum control was dominant, teachers may have felt more certain of their task, but less constrained to innovate. In a school like Pinehill, where individual teachers could control what they taught, teachers may not have felt as certain of their impact on students, but better able to experiment. However, simply allowing teachers autonomy and not interfering in their classroom work may leave teachers most interested in content/skills isolated, having to develop outside supports.

If greater integration or greater work control are used as levers to affect teacher engagement, it is important to address the interactive effects of any changes. The kind of work control allowed teachers at each school seemed to correspond closely with the kind of integrative environment which prevailed at the school. Thus, changing the kind or level of integration is likely to produce both changes in work control and engagement. Changing the kind of work control may affect integration.

In summary, what can we learn about these two schools that we could apply to the enhancement of teacher engagement? Particular integrative environments are associated with particular kinds of work control and particular kinds or combinations of engagements. Integration and work control interactively affect the level and types of teacher engagement in schools. Asking what structures or combinations of structures, in what combinations affect what kinds of engagement in schools in differing kinds of communities suggests the need both for thought about what kinds of teaching/learning we value most and a challenge to our ability to think in situationally-relevant and complex terms.

SOURCES

Aiken, Michael., and Hage, Jerald. 1966. "Organizational Alienation: A Comparative Analysis." American Sociological Review. 31:497-507.

Barr, Rebecca and Dreeben, Robert. 1983. How Schools Work. Chicago. University of Chicago Press.

Becker, Howard S. 1960. "Notes on the Concept of Commitment." American Journal of Sociology. 66:32-40.

Bidwell, Charles E. 1965 "The School as a Formal Organization." Pp. 972-1022 in Handbook of Organizations, edited by James March. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Blauner, Robert. 1964. Alienation and Freedom. Chicago. University of Chicago Press.

Boyer, Ernest. 1983. High school. New York: Harper and Row Publishers.

Connell, Robert. 1985. Teachers' Work. Sydney: George Allen and Unwin.

Corcoran, Thomas B. 1985. "Effective Secondary Schools." Pp. 71-97 in Reaching for Excellence: An Effective School Sourcebook, edited by Regcha Kyle. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Corwin, Ronald G. 1981. Patterns of Organizational Control and Militancy: Theoretical Continuities in the Idea of 'Loose Coupling.'" Pp. 261-291 in Research in Sociology of Education and Socialization, Vol. 2, edited by Ronald Corwin. Greenwich, Conn.: JAI Press.

Cusick, Philip A. 1983. The Egalitarian Ideal and the American High School. New York: Longman.

Darling-Hammond, Linda. 1984. Beyond the Commission Reports-The Coming Crisis in Teaching. Santa Monica, Calif.: The Rand Corporation.

Dreeben, Robert. 1973. "The School as a Workplace." Pp. 450-473 in Second Handbook of Research in Teaching, edited by R. M. Travers. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Dreeben, Robert. 1970. The Nature of Teaching. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Co., Inc.

Erickson, Kai. 1986. "On Work and Alienation." American Sociological Review. 51 (February):1-8.

Etzioni, Amitai. 1975. A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations. New York: The Free Press.

Finley, Merilee. 1984. "Teachers and Tracking In A Comprehensive High School." Sociology of Education. 57:233-243.

Firestone, William A. 1985. "The Study of Loose Coupling: Problems, Progress and Prospects." Pp. 3-30 in Research in Sociology of Education and Socialization, Vol. 5, edited by Alan C. Kerckhoff. Greenwich, Conn.: JAI Press.

Freedman, Sara., Jackson, J. and Boles, K. 1983. "Teaching: an 'imperiled' profession." Pp. 261-299 in The Handbook of Teaching and Policy, edited by Gary Sykes & Lee Schulman. New York: Longman.

Fuller, Bruce and Izu, Jo Ann. 1986. "Explaining School Cohesion: What Shapes the Organizational Beliefs of Teachers." American Journal of Education. August:501-535.

Gemoran, Adam and Dreeben, Robert. 1986. "Coupling and Control in Educational Organizations." Administrative Science Quarterly. 31:612-632.

Hammersley, Martyn. 1984. "Staffroom News." Pp. 203-214 in Classrooms and Staffrooms, edited by Andy Hargreaves and Peter Woods. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Hargreaves, Andy. 1984. "Contrastive Rhetoric and Extremist Talk." Pp. 215-231 in Classrooms and Staffrooms, edited by Andy Hargreaves and Peter Woods. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Hargreaves, David H. 1967. Social Relations in a Secondary School. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Hemmings, Annette. 1988. "Real Teaching: How High School Teachers Negotiate National, Community, and Student Pressures When They Define Their Work." Paper presented to the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA: April.

Kottkamp, Robert B., Provenzo, Eugene E. Jr., and Cohn, Marilyn M. 1986. "Stability and Change in a Profession: Two Decades of Teacher Attitudes, 1964-1984." Phi Delta Kappan. April:559-567.

Lacey, Colin. 1977. The Socialization of Teachers. Bungey, Suffolk: Chaucer.

Little, Judith W. 1982. "Norms of Collegiality and Experimentation: Workplace Conditions of Schooling," American Educational Research Journal. 19(3): 325-340.

Lortie, Dan C. 1986. "Teacher Status in Dade County: A Case of Structural Strain?" Phi Delta Kappan. April:568-575.

Lortie, Dan C. 1975. Schoolteacher. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lortie, Dan C. 1973. "Observations on Teaching as Work." Pp. 474-497 in Second Handbook of Research in Teaching, edited by R.M. Travers. Chicago: Rand McNally.

McPherson, Gertrude. Small Town Teacher. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, Mass., 1972.

Metz, Mary. 1978. Classrooms and Corridors. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Metz, Mary. 1986. Different By Design. New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Metz, Mary. 1988. "'The American High School': A Universal Drama Amid Disparate Experience." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA, April.

Meyer, John and Rowan, Brian. 1977. "Institutionalized organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony." American Journal of Sociology. 83:340-362.

Moeller, Gerald H. and Charters, W.W. 1966. "Relation of Bureaucratization to Sense of Power Among Teachers." Administrative Science Quarterly. 10(4):444-465.

Nias, Jennifer. 1981. "'Commitment' and Motivation in Primary School Teachers." Educational Review. 33(3):181-190.

Powell, Arthur., Farrar, Eleanor. and Cohen, David. 1985. The Shopping Mall High School. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.

Rosenholtz, Susan. 1985. "Effective Schools: Interpreting the Evidence." American Journal of Education. 93(3):352-388.

Seeman, Melvin. 1975. "Alienation Studies." Pp. 91-123 in Annual Review of Sociology, vol I, edited by Alex Inkeles, and James Coleman. Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews, Inc.

Seeman, Melvin. 1972. "Alienation and Engagement." Pp. 467-527 in The Human Meaning of Social Change, edited by Philip E. Converse and Angus Campbell. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Shanker, Albert. 1985. "The Revolution That's Overdue." Phi Delta Kappan. January:311-315.

Sizer, Theodore R. 1985. Horace's Compromise. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.

Sykes, Gary. 1984. "The conference." A paper presented to the California Roundtable on Educational Opportunity's Symposium on the Teaching Profession. Asilomar, California.

Thompson, James D. 1967. Organizations in Action. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Tye, Barbara B. 1985. Multiple Realities: A Study of 13 American High Schools. Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America.

Webb, Rodman and Ashton, Patricia. 1986. Making A Difference. New York: Longman.

Weick, Karl. 1983 (1976). "Educational Organizations as Loosely Coupled Systems." Pp. 15-37 in The Dynamics of Organizational Change in Education, edited by J. Baldridge and T. Deal. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.

Weinshank, Annette., Trumbull, E. and Daly, P. 1983. "The role of the teacher in school change." Pp. 300-314 in The Handbook of Teaching and Policy, edited by Gary Sykes and Lee Schulman. New York: Longman.

Woods, Peter. 1983. Sociology and the School. London, England: Routledge and Kegan Paul plc.

Woods, Peter. 1984. "Staffroom Humour." Pp. 190-202 in Classrooms and Staffrooms, edited by Andy Hargreaves and Peter Woods. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Zielinski, Arlene E. and Hoy, Wayne K. 1983. "Isolation and Alienation in Elementary Schools. Educational Administration Quarterly. 19(2):27-45.

VII. "SOME MISSING ELEMENTS IN THE REFORM MOVEMENT"

Mary Haywood Metz

VI. "SOME MISSING ELEMENTS IN THE REFORM MOVEMENT"

Mary Haywood Metz

SOME MISSING ELEMENTS IN THE REFORM MOVEMENT#

by

Mary Haywood Metz

National Center on Effective Secondary Schools

University of Wisconsin—Madison*

Paper to appear in a special issue of Educational Administration Quarterly on the reform movement.

*The research on which this paper is based was supported by the National Center on Effective Secondary Schools at the Wisconsin Center on Education Research which is supported by a grant from the Office of Educational Research and Improvement Grant #G-00869007. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, or the United States Department of Education.

SOME MISSING ELEMENTS IN THE EDUCATIONAL REFORM MOVEMENT

MARY HAYWOOD METZ

NATIONAL CENTER ON EFFECTIVE SECONDARY SCHOOLS

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN—MADISON

This paper analyzes the educational reform movement as it applies to high schools. It makes explicit what appear to be some unrecognized assumptions which narrow its vision; it considers the sources and consequences of those assumptions and suggests a broader vision. It is difficult to speak of "the reform movement", even when limiting the subject to high schools, because it is not a single entity but a chorus of many voices which do not sing in harmony much of the time. Rather than picking a few documents to analyze, I will nonetheless address the movement as a whole.

Recently, analysts have been speaking of a first and second wave of reform. The first stresses standardization of curriculum and centralized testing of both students and teachers. It is typified in the report of the National Commission on Excellence (1983) and other discussions of an improvement in and nationalization of school curricula and in initiatives in many states and large districts to standardize curricula and to institute competency tests and increase standardized testing. The second wave, especially in high school reform, stresses upgrading of teacher education and restructuring of teachers' roles to make those roles more professional—more collegial, less tied to the classroom, and inclusive of career

stages. It is typified in the report of the Carnegie Forum's Task Force on Teaching as a Profession (1986) and widespread discussion of "restructuring the high school" which emphasizes staff roles. While both waves of reform share the assumptions analyzed here, there are some relevant differences between them.

The paper arises out my consideration of the reform movement in tandem with a study of teachers' working lives at eight "ordinary" high schools in socially diverse settings which I have been conducting as part of the work of the National Center on Effective Secondary Schools.[1] That effort was informed by my perspective as a sociologist of education with a background of qualitative studies of schools.

SOME KEY ASSUMPTIONS IN THE REFORM MOVEMENT

The reform movement makes an overarching assumption which frames all the others I want to address. It is the assumption that schools are much more alike than they are different. They can consequently be reformed with across the board policies. The garment of reform comes in one size which will fit all. This assumption is less extreme in the second wave reforms. Here, though restructuring the staffs of high schools is a single change which will improve all schools, that restructuring is suggested in a form which will give increased autonomy to teachers who can then adjust their behavior to deal with variations in the context and in students.

The assumption that a school is a school and a student a student, that all are fundamentally alike, has a long history in American educational discourse. It reflects our national image of public schools as all essentially the same, a national ritual experience, which provide us a common background. It is consonant with our cherished tenet that all American children start out on the same footing, to

become differentiated only as they display differential talent and effort.

At the same time, as I will argue in more detail later, every one knows that schools differ significantly because most are located in communities where housing is homogeneous in class and race and school boundaries are drawn to encourage homogeneity. Human and material resources are thus highly variable in our "standard" schools. Consequently, across the board reforms will have quite different consequences in different settings. For example, a combination of reasoning and early data suggest that when states increase the number of academic courses required for graduation, affluent communities where students aspire to selective colleges are little affected because their requirements were that high or higher already, while poor areas are likely to experience increased dropout rates because many students do not have the skills or the time to accomplish the required work, or fear they do not (McDill et al., 1986). It is in the middle level, average, communities that the intended effects will most likely be seen. These schools will in fact have to raise their requirements and large numbers of students who have the skills, but not the desire, to take such courses, may be pushed into more effort and perhaps more learning. However, in every context, individual schools may differ from the norm and individual schools may transform the impact of the state requirement as they reinterpret it and fit it into the total context of their school—or as enterprising staff use it to their purposes(Clune, 1987).

Since reformers know that schools really do differ despite the claim that they are formally alike, one can anticipate that recommended reforms will be implicitly targeted toward schools serving one kind of student or another. It would appear that reformers pushing increased graduation requirements probably have foremost in their minds average and above average students, heading for skilled and semi-skilled

work or for colleges with relaxed admissions policies. At the risk of overgeneralizing, it may be fair to say that the first wave of reform is targeted primarily at such average to slightly above average students, while the second wave is targeted primarily at leading students—though the reports which give impetus to both make claims that their nostrums will be equally beneficial to all students.

In this paper I will address some of the important dimensions of school life, which the reform movement neglects, as it assumes all schools are alike. I will suggest some ways in which consideration of these dimensions of school life might enable a third wave of reform to be based upon a more accurate model of the phenomenon it wishes to change. Consideration of these dimensions would also help a third wave of reform to address the schools in the most difficulty, those serving predominantly poor and minority children. With one fourth of our children growing up in poverty and one third members of minority groups, we can not afford to consider the education of such children a side issue. Their schooling is the schooling of a substantial portion of the next generation of adults.

The Assumption that Structure and Technology Define the Schools

In the last two years, while doing a study which I intended to be policy relevant, I found myself repeatedly presented with a conflict between the confident assumption of the reformers that one could speak easily of the needs of, and reform in, "The American High School" and what I knew about schools from literature in sociology and anthropology, my own previous work, and what we were seeing during our study of eight high schools. I came to see that the reformers' discourse centers on two organizational aspects of schools—their social structure and their technical arrangements. At the same time, our research team was noticing that social structure and technical arrangements were indeed remarkably

similar, at least in outline, from school to school.

All of our high schools had similar temporal structures of six to nine class hours, similar "egg crate" physical layouts in which one teacher met with twenty to thirty students for one class hour five days a week for a year,[2] similar subject offerings with similar scope and sequence for the curriculum, and even the same textbooks, despite radically different academic skills in the student body. We found teachers' and administrators' duties and their role descriptions showed little variation across schools. Rules for students were also similar, though not similarly obeyed or enforced. In short, in the formal elements of social, physical, and temporal structure, and in the official curriculum, the schools were alike just as reformers saw them to be.

The reform movement assumes that these formal characteristics of schools are their most important, their defining characteristics. What we saw, was that they form a frame for interaction, or provide a script for the play we came to call Real School. All the schools used the same script, but the actors in the different performances at the different schools rendered widely divergent interpretations of both their own characters and the overall meaning of the play. They also freely improvised on their lines and changed their entrances and exits to suit their desires. Nonetheless all of the school staffs, and most of the students, found it important to dramatize the legitimacy of the school by following the script for Real School.

There was wide variation in the meaning of the temporal, physical, and social structures and the curricular practices which constitute Real School, in their impact on the tasks of teaching and learning, and in the resulting overall experience of both staff and students at the different schools. While social structures might be

the same, cultural meanings were different.[3]

Academic learning was also different. We often saw the "same" course, such as British literature, American history, or physics at schools located in widely differing communities. Students at two schools might, for example, read Macbeth and work with it five days a week for two or three weeks in a group of twenty to thirty students with the help of one teacher, but the content of classroom discourse, the questions asked on tests, and students' written work might vary enormously. Similarly, the quality of the relationship between the students and the teacher was sometimes radically different in classes which were formally "the same" at different schools, giving the students different messages about themselves as learners and budding citizens vis-a-vis the public institution of the school.

The reform movement treats these variations as epiphenomena, insignificant variations around a single theme, or as deviance, compromise of a valid template for good education. We thought they could be better interpreted as attempts to adjust to significant cultural variation among communities and the students they produced (Metz, 1987). But they were incomplete adjustments, and often academically unsuccessful ones, which were greatly constrained by the structures and expectations associated with Real School.

Over the last twenty years, anthropologists of education have built up a sizable literature documenting significant impacts of cultural differences between various groups of ethnic minority students and the mainstream public schools. Some recent work has looked at schools which have worked successfully with culturally different minorities, some by teaching in their own cultural idiom and some without making such adjustments (Erickson, 1987). There is also—much more scattered—evidence that there are significant cultural differences among whites according to class,

ethnicity, region, and rural-urban differences (e.g. Heath 1983, Peshkin 1978, Rubin, 1972).

There is active and legitimate controversy over whether culturally different groups are better served by stern insistence that they abandon their own culture and accept majority culture or by instruction which attempts to provide a bridge between their home culture and school culture. However, the reform movement does not join this controversy. It scarcely acknowledges that cultural differences with educational implications exist.

In our eight schools cultural differences were rarely explicitly acknowledged—even though some adjustments for them were pragmatically made. Instead, school staffs strove to hew as close to their own idea of a national curriculum and pattern of relationships as the students would allow them to. At our middle and low income schools, acting out the forms of Real School sometimes became an end in itself, leaving little energy for anything else. The problem was most visible at Charles Drew High School, the school with the most economically deprived, lowest achieving students—black students who lived in a deeply isolated ghetto. An energetic principal seemed torn between efforts, on the one hand, to relax enforcement of adherence to the rituals of Real School, because these alienated or discouraged many students, and efforts, on the other hand, aggressively to promote a demanding academic curriculum, out of determination that the students would get a genuine high school education. This attempt both to adjust to the students and to maintain a nationally approved pattern resulted in offering courses and using books which resembled those at the high income schools in our study, while the discourse, the tests, the written work, student attendance, and the general atmosphere at this school were radically different from those at the high

income schools.

The first wave of reform would suggest a firmer enforcement of the rituals of Real School to improve this situation. Its proponents would push for more testing, publishing test scores, stiff academic requirements for graduation, a more detailed centrally prescribed curriculum, and perhaps writing final examinations at the central office. Some of these first wave prescriptions, for example, the requirement of advanced academic courses for graduation and the publication of test scores are already in place at this school, without dramatic impact on its problems. The second wave of reform would suggest a new faculty with more liberal arts training at more cosmopolitan institutions and more time away from students to plan curriculum. These nostrums do not touch the fact that the behavioral and academic rituals of Real School seem to connect poorly with these students.

A third wave of reform should start from the overarching purpose of school to help students' develop their full intellectual potential in their own and their parents' terms, while also providing them academic skills and with understanding of, and ability to participate in, mainstream culture. It would then be possible to cast a critical eye upon Real School, inquiring whether some or all of its patterns are indeed appropriate and constructive for educating particular groups of students. It would be possible to consider and experiment with innovative patterns of curriculum and daily activity which might provide intentional bridges between students' culture and mainstream learning and organizational patterns.

There are thorny issues here. Where mainstream culture differs from that of ethnic minorities, rural white communities, or working class enclaves, one must consider the relative legitimacy of each as a context for the curricular content and

relational style of public school education. These issues go to fundamental questions of what constitutes legitimate school knowledge and what constitutes acceptable school decorum. These issues are too complex to explore in this paper, but a third wave of reform should confront them.

The Assumption That Adults Determine What Happens in Schools

The documents of the reform movement have very little to say about students, but much to say about curriculum, and about staffing. The first wave and the second wave of reform conceive the appropriate role of teachers in radically different terms, but both presume that one can reform the schools' performance by reforming the teachers' roles and the quality of their performance. This position presumes that students are passive agents who will learn, if only they are taught. Control in the school lies (or should lie) solely with adults.

In practice, teachers must adjust their teaching to a multitude of characteristics of their students. The whole point of teaching, the whole reason for being of the schools, is to create changes in the students. The characteristics of the students as they are when they enter the school must be considered in determining the appropriate process of change. American students come to high school with a wide variety of academic skills, general knowledge, attitudes, cognitive styles, cultural beliefs, and ambitions. A school and a classroom teacher who take no account of each of these, are likely to be unsuccessful in creating the changes they plan.

It is always true, as Chester Barnard pointed out fifty years ago (1962 [1938]), that authority in formal organizations, of which schools are one example, exists only when subordinates grant their superordinates a legitimate claim upon their obedience, when they "decide to participate" in the organizational system at hand, with its moral claims upon them. (Even though students are legally required to be

physically present, they can withold social participation—and some high school students do.) Even after the decision to participate, subordinates still subject commands from above to scrutiny for their consistency with the system of moral claims which support superiors' superordination and for their consistency with agreed upon terms of effort.

Barnard's insight may attract little notice in those schools where students enter the school accepting parental and community beliefs that the school has a right to expect their obedience to a broad range of commands from school staff.[4] Students "decision to participate" as subordinates becomes more visibly problematic when they have lost faith in the school and its personnel as an agency which will assist them to prepare for adult life, when they are skeptical of the truth of many of the school staff's claims, and when they do not share in the values, life experience, or cultural style of expression informing teachers' efforts. By now there is a good deal of evidence that such conditions are widespread not only among minorities (Erickson, 1987; Ogbu 1978) but among large proportions of majority students, especially those headed for the workforce or for less selective colleges after high school (Cusick, 1983; McNeil, 1986; Powell, 1985; Sedlak et al., 1986; Sizer, 1984).

At five of our eight schools, the majority of students acted as though they had such skeptical attitudes or found a gulf between the school and themselves. A few students acted this way at the other three schools as well. The three schools which were exceptions were two public and one Catholic school with mostly middle class to upper middle class students. Most were headed for college and many for at least somewhat selective colleges.

The teachers we talked with were intuitively aware that their own success was contingent on students' cooperation and performance. Some were very articulate

about that fact. Teachers' efforts and their sense of their own worth as craftspersons were deeply shaped by the ease or difficulty with which they could win their students' interest in and cooperation with the learning task.

In this situation, it is not sensible for the reform movement to put regulatory pressures upon, or change training for, teachers without a component that helps them increase students' engagement. Even upgrading the skills of teachers will not help, unless such upgrading includes assisting them in developing methods which are responsive to their students' life experience, purposes, and perspectives. The first wave of reform responds to students' reluctance to put out academic effort primarily through coercive requirements. The second makes reference to fitting schools to community desires and perspectives and to making school tasks more complex and intrinsically interesting, but it still passes lightly over the question of how the changes it envisions can be made attractive to what some observers say are the seventy percent of students who have lost faith in the value of both the content and the credential available from a high school education.

In my previous work, studying desegregated, socially diverse junior high and middle schools (Metz 1978, 1986), it was evident that many aspects of children's social and racial backgrounds affect their own behavior and also the perceptions and actions of their teachers toward them. It was also evident in these studies, however, that students' social class and racial backgrounds were by no means the whole story. At least at the middle school level, curricular approaches, social structures and cultures developed within the schools could create conditions which went far to counterbalance students' initial readiness or lack of readiness to be cooperative and enthusiastic about school, based on their life situation outside of school (Metz, 1986). Schools are powerfully influenced by the characteristics of

their clienteles, but these pressures are not irresistible.

As the reform movement develops, it should address the students' point of view head on. It should analyze the perspectives and prospects of the full range of high school students, and consider how to design—or enable and empower school staffs to design—forms of high school education which students in differing life circumstances will find credible, interesting, and helpful for their futures. At the same time it must still be a high school education which the mainstream of society will consider legitimate and socially useful.

The Assumption that Schools Are Separate from Their Communities

In paying little attention to differences between schools serving children from different backgrounds, the documents and actions of the reform movement assume that the school's life can be separated from the social context and life trajectories which students experience outside the schools. But this is a questionable assumption. At the high school level, not only students' backgrounds but their assessments of their future prospects affect their response to their schools. High school points students toward occupational slots. A few voices (Sedlak et al, 1986) suggest that lack of engagement in school not only among poor students, but among middle income students not headed for selective colleges, is more a function of the lack of relevance or fatefulness of high school performance for their futures than of processes within the schools themselves. Anthropologist John Ogbu (1978) has long argued that minority students who see older relatives even with diplomas chronically unemployed will not make an effort in school in order to earn a place in the workforce.

In our study, teachers also were affected by their anticipation of their students' futures. They often framed answers to questions about their goals in teaching in

terms of what they perceived to be their students' destinations. Where those futures were limited and students unconcerned with school, teachers also were at risk of becoming demoralized. At Ulysses S. Grant, a racially mixed low income school, staff attitudes were summed up by the secretary to the vocational counselor, when I asked her for the list of destinations for the last year's seniors. She replied, "Our students aren't going anywhere," (but then did produce a list of their anticipated destinations).

To ignore the impact of anticipated unemployment or marginally skilled employment upon the attitudes and activities of both students and teachers is to ignore a major part of the reality of school life. If reformers are to help schools where students' backgrounds and futures give them little reason to be interested in school, they must acknowledge the nature and the difficulty of the task such schools face in creating an internal life which attempts to counteract children's social experience on the outside.

Reformers of a third wave who want to facilitate an improvement in educational processes within the schools must not only look for ways to insulate the schools from discouraging outside influences. They must also argue for improvement in the living conditions and future prospects of children for whom both sap educational commitment. Reformers who argue that schools affect the economy should acknowledge the impact upon the schools of students' families' economic circumstances and of the contracting economic opportunities available to the half of graduates not planning to attend four year colleges.

style[spacing 2 lines, spread 0 lines]

SOURCES AND CONSEQUENCES OF THE REFORM MOVEMENT'S ASSUMPTIONS

Why should most of the voices of the reform movement cling to the assumptions I have enumerated? One reason seems to be relatively straightforward. The reform movement is aimed at concrete changes in formal policy of the states, school districts, and teacher training institutions. All the complexities I have discussed are not easily amenable to managerial intervention. In its orientation toward formal policymaking, the reform movement limits itself to issues which are subject to direct policy manipulation.

While such a stance is understandable, the policy changes it forwards will not be successful if they are based on simplifying assumptions which ignore processes that may be of critical importance, even though not under the control of educational policymakers. The second wave of reform makes some effort to address this problem, by advocating reforms which give teachers in each school considerable flexibility for varied practice. They can then be responsive to the processes I have discussed in ways which are not legislated.

The reform movement is not only administratively oriented but politically oriented. The reports which formed its initial impetus and its manifestoes, were political rallying cries, designed to enlist popular support for new attention to and resources for education. As political statements, they had to take account of political realities. Differences in quality among schools according to social class are well known, but still politically explosive. They are explosive in two rather different ways.

Poor people and especially minorities, often suspect that a condemnation of their children's intellectual abilities or moral worth lies implicit in statements which emphasize differences in schools according to their social class or racial composition. Should the reform movement suggest plans to diversify educational

strategies in schools serving different clienteles, some citizens might read these plans as proposals for a second class education for poorer or minority children, something less than Real School. Nor is such a fear illusory. It is not easy to construct designs for schools that are tailored to students' backgrounds but still eventually lead them to knowledge and credentials which give them full access to mainstream culture and economic opportunities. Reformers cautiously stick to the safer ground of proposing reforms across the board, lest they be accused of making invidious distinctions between children on the basis of class or color.

The second political agenda to which these reports are responsive requires a more complex analysis and is potentially far more subversive of any real educational improvement resulting from their efforts. Like most public discourse on education, these reports assume that the purpose of schools is to teach the young the content of the curriculum and some of the social graces required to be a member in good standing of a school community. But education plays another very important role for society in preparing the young to enter into adult roles. It sorts the group of babies born in any year, looking very much alike in their hospital cribs, into a set of eighteen year olds divided into groups labeled as barely employable, possessing moderate skill, capable of much further development, or showing extreme promise. The public schools rank the students who emerge from their doors after thirteen years in ways which are fateful for those young people's work, their economic fortunes, and their status among other members of society.

Imagine what would happen if some year the end the reports apparently seek were actually accomplished. All the graduates of all of the high schools in the country were successfully educated, so that all of them scored in the 99th percentile on standardized tests and made perfect scores on the Scholastic Aptitude

Test, not to mention having perfect A records throughout their schooling.

Chaos would ensue. Colleges would not have room for all, but would have little ground on which to accept some and reject others. Employers looking for secretaries, retail salespersons, waiters, bus drivers, and factory workers would have jobs unfilled as every student considered such work beneath his or her accomplishments.

As long as education is used to rank young people and sort them into occupational futures which differ substantially in their attractiveness and intrinsic as well as monetary rewards, good education, or students' success at education, must remain a scarce commodity. Those who do succeed have less competition to deal with if large numbers of others do not.

In the United States we say we do not believe in passing privilege from parent to child. We expect individuals to earn the favored slots in society through talent and hard work. The schools have been given the task of judging that talent and diligence. Consequently it is important to our national sense of a social system which is fairly ordered that all children have an equal opportunity through education. If we are to say that success in education is a fair and just criterion by which to award each child a slot in an adult occupational hierarchy based upon individual merit, then the poorest child must have access to as good an education as the richest.

How, then, to guarantee an equal education? By guaranteeing the <u>same</u> education. The reform movement speaks of high schools as all alike, because it is important to our political sense of fairness that they be all alike. The similar social structures and the near standardization of curricula across high schools give a skeletal reality to that claim. The reform reports reflect a strong public

consensus on the importance of offering a standard high school experience to all American children.

Nonetheless, there is unspoken public knowledge of the operation of an opposing principle. In practice, the public perceives schools to be actually very unequal. Middle class parents will make considerable sacrifices to locate their children in schools perceived to be superior. Communities of parents with the economic and political means to do so will construct superior schools for their own children and see to it that others are denied access to them.

This process is such an open secret that, in communities large enough to have several schools, realtors advertise houses according to their school attendance area, when those houses are located where schools have a reputation for high quality—usually based on drawing a large number of children from well-educated and/or affluent families. Houses in such neighborhoods can cost thousands of dollars more than equivalent structures in neighborhoods where schools have a less sterling reputation.

Separate suburban school districts allow their residents far more control over the means to create superior schools based on selected peers and superior resources. Ordinances requiring certain sizes for lots, or only single occupancy housing, can keep out lower income families. Fair Housing groups across the country document the continued practice of racial steering by real estate agents; it can be used to keep many suburban communities all or mostly white. These districts also can take advantage of their higher tax base to add the amenities of higher salaries for teachers, small class sizes, and richer stores of materials to their "standard" schools.

As a political entity, Americans seem to live with this contradiction between

officially equal education based on standardization of curriculum and activities, on the one hand, and, on the other, tremendous variety in the quality and content of education arising from the linkage of public education to local funding and to housing which is segregated by social class as well as race. We rarely see, let alone openly acknowledge, the contradiction between these two principles. Political scientist Murray Edelman (1977) argues that simultaneous acceptance of such contradictory perspectives is a common feature in our political life.

Society's blindness to this contradiction serves the interests of the well-educated middle class. Children in schools with better prepared peers, which are attractive to better prepared teachers, have a considerable advantage in competition with the other products of America's standard and equal public schools. But middle class leaders feel no inconsistency in claiming that the young are rewarded according to merit even though they take care to place their individual children in contexts which foster merit much more actively than those to which other children find themselves consigned. Our societal blindness to our contradictory perceptions of American schools allows a large part of the populace to experience as fair a "race" for societal rewards in which competitors are given unequal resources depending on their parents' status.

The reform movement's implicit endorsement of the official view of public schools as all alike, and its near silence about the tremendous variations in American schools, endorses and reenforces the continuance of this contradiction in American education.

CONCLUSION

I believe the reform morevement is correct in perceiving serious problems in a

large proportion of public schools. My critique of its solutions stems from a perspective based on prolonged contact with individual schools and from a grounding in sociological and anthropological literature which is similarly based. It is easier to see the problems I have suggested a third wave of reform might address after one has lived in the schools a while—and has participated in those of varied communities. It is important to be attentive to the genuine dilemmas and to the real distress which lie behind the resigned, indifferent, or angry facades which both students and teachers bring to classrooms in schools for the poor and increasingly to classrooms in schools for the broad middle band of society.

Since the "old" reforms of the sixties and seventies, policy analysts have learned some long hard lessons. They have seen that their policies are sometimes not implemented at all despite fervent promises, and frequently not implemented as planned. Even more important, they have seen that, when they are implemented, they often do not have the desired effects and do have other, unanticipated and often unwanted, effects. Milbrey McLaughlin summarizes this experience, and argues that "policymakers can't mandate what matters" (1987, p. 172). However, to say this is not to say that "what policymakers mandate doesn't matter". It does matter, though it may not have the effects which were intended or desired.

Both waves of the reform movement do have laudable goals. But policymakers will do a disservice if they attempt reforms which take no account of cultural differences between communities, of students' perspectives, and of the conditions of students' lives outside as well as inside the school. Reformers will aggravate problems experienced by many students and teachers if they impose on all of them patterns which are designed for the needs of only some of them, in the name of the American myth of standardized and therefore equal schools.

ENDNOTES

1. Our study was a double one, with one group, which I led, concentrating on the work of teachers in the eight schools, and the other group, led by Professor Richard Rossmiller, concentrating on the work of administrators. Other research staff working with us were Nancy Lesko, Annette Hemmings, Alexander K. Tyree Jr. and Jeffrey Jacobson.

2. One of our schools, a large Catholic school, did have a different temporal structure and grouping of students into large and small instructional groups. This was "flexible scheduling" from the seventies, but the school had informally developed many of the structural features which the second wave of reform suggests. It had flexibility of schedule and instructional strategy, collegial consultation among teachers, mentoring and involvement of department chairs in evaluation, and teachers' participation in policy making.

3. I have argued the central role of school culture, as it is created within individual schools, in two extended studies of desegregated schools (Metz, 1978, 1986). In the eight high schools different cultures imported from the communities often shaped the schools' internal cultures.

4. That Barnard's insight is not irrelevant even there is underscored, by the writing of his contemporary Willard Waller (1965 [1932]), about small town American schools of the twenties, where, Waller believed, teachers' control was always fragile and contested by students, despite community support for its legitimacy.

REFERENCES

Barnard, C. I. (1962) The functions of the executive. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press. (First published 1938.)

Clune, W. (1987) Findings on student standards from the state wave and implications for further research. Madison, WI: Center for Policy Research in Education, University of Wisconsin. (Unpublished draft.)

Cusick, P. (1983) The equalitarian ideal and the American high school. New York: Longman.

Edelman, M. (1977) Political language: Words that succeed and policies that fail. New York: Academic Press.

Erickson, F. (1987) "Transformation and school success: The politics and culture of educational achievement," Anthropology and Education Quarterly 18 335-356.

Heath, S. B> (1983) Ways with Words: Language, life, and work in communities and classrooms. New York: Cambridge University Press.

McDill, E. L., Natriello, G., & Pallas, A. M. (1986) A population at risk: Potential consequences of tougher school standards for student dropouts. American Journal of Education 94 135-181.

McLaughlin, M. W. (1987) Learning from experience: Lessons from policy implementation. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis 9 171-178.

McNeil, L. M. (1986) Contradictions of control: School structure and school knowledge. New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Metz, M.H. (1978) Classrooms and corridors: The crisis of authority in desegregated secondary schools. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Metz, M.H. (1986) Different by design: The context and character of three magnet

schools. New York: Methuen/Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Metz, M.H. (1987) "The impact of cultural variation on high school teaching." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Anthropological Association, Chicago, November.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983) A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.

Ogbu, J. U. (1978) Minority education and caste: The American system in cross-cultural perspective. New York: Academic Press.

Peshkin, A. (1978) Growing up American: Schooling and the survival of community. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Powell, A. G., Farrar, E. & Cohen, D. K. (1985) The shopping mall high school: Winners and losers in the educational marketplace. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Rubin, L. B. (1972) Busing and backlash: White against white in anurban school district. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Sedlak, M. W., Wheeler, C. W., Pullin, D.C., & Cusick, P. A. (1986) Selling students short: Classroom bargains and academic reform in the American high school. New York: Teachers College Press.

Sizer, T. R. (1984) Horace's compromise: The dilemma of the American high school. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. (1986) A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century. New York: Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy.

Waller, W. (1965) The sociology of teaching. New York: John Wiley. (First published 1932.)

VII. CONCLUSION

2.5
2.8
3.2
3.6
4.0
4.5
2.2
2.0
100 mm
1.0
1.1
1.25
1.4
1.6
1.8
ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRSTUVWXYZ
abcdefghijklmnopqrstuvwxyz
1234567890
1.0 mm
1.5 mm
2.0 mm
A5

FINAL REPORT

FIELD STUDY ON TEACHERS' ENGAGEMENT

PROJECT ON THE EFFECTS OF THE SCHOOL AS A WORKPLACE

ON TEACHERS' ENGAGEMENT

NATIONAL CENTER ON EFFECTIVE SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Mary Haywood Metz, Principal Investigator

CONCLUSION

In this conclusion to the papers constituting our final report, I will briefly discuss some important findings from the study that have not found their way into the papers here. I will also address two questions raised by reviewers of the papers that are better addressed for the group as a whole. One question, with which I begin this conclusion, concerns the degree too which it is possible to draw conclusions based on a study of eight schools that must, after all, have various idiosyncratic characteristics. The other question, with which I end the conclusion, was an insistent request for discussion of the policy implications of our findings. In the last section of this conclusion, I bow to these requests, with the caveat that parts of what I have to say necessarily carry the argument beyond the data.

THE GENERALIZABILITY OF FINDINGS FROM THE EIGHT STUDY SCHOOLS

In broad terms we think the schools we studied are quite typical, but they did have some special characteristics that potentially limit the generalizability of the data. First, these schools are metropolitan schools. The large size of metropolitan areas allows a fine-grained sorting of housing and especially of schools by social class that is more pronounced than may be common in small, independent communities.[1]

Second, these schools are in the midwest. Charles Drew, in The Metropolis, is in one of the country's largest urban centers where real wealth and power and abject poverty are concentrated, but the others are all within the ambience of the City. The City does not generate the extreme wealth or large areas of poverty whose limits stretch farther than eye and imagination can reach that can be found in the largest urban centers. Still, The City's metropolitan area does have strong class distinctions in its neighborhoods and suburbs, in other words in its housing. Furthermore, The City and its suburbs are among the four most racially segregated in the country. In addition, according to the 1980 census, the income of blacks is substantially lower than that of whites. Indeed, income for blacks is slightly lower than the average for blacks in the one hundred largest cities, even though whites' income is higher than that of whites in the largest one hundred cities. Still, it is probably the case that The City and its suburbs provide less stark contrasts based on social class than would a set of communities around The Metropolis or around

any of the larger urban centers on the east and west coasts.

The effects of class on high school are also shaped by the fact that the state university in this midwestern state is considered not only a good institution, but an acceptable destination for all classes. Maple Heights was the only one of our schools where more than a handful of students sought admission to selective eastern colleges. Even at Cherry Glen, which did bring in many college recruiters from private institutions, the vast majority of able students went to the state university, with a few going to private institutions in nearby parts of the state.

Third, our sample is probably atypical in consisting of better than average schools in terms of their staff relations, despite our search for ordinary schools. Though we obtained permission from central offices, we usually initiated our contacts with principals. We had to make inquiries at twelve schools to get eight. Three principals and one central office turned us down. It took some courage on the part of principals to give free rein to a team of four to five researchers who moved freely about the school for a period of over two weeks and also observed and interviewed in depth teachers the researchers picked themselves. Only principals with few skeletons in their closets were likely to grant such freedom to a team with the intimidating name of The National Center on Effective Secondary Schools. In the three largest systems, our principals were more conscripted by central office personnel. In The Metropolis, that lead to our being steered to Drew, which was, if not an exemplary school, at least one that was, we thought, not typical in some important respects. In The City and in Silas, it lead us to schools, Grant and Quincy, that were perhaps more genuinely "ordinary", or average, than the other schools.

Ironically, however, the peculiarities in our sample do not undermine many of the major points we have made, but rather underscore them. If social class creates fundamental differences in teachers' experiences between schools even in the relatively egalitarian midwest in a city where the range of social class is not extreme, then we can expect it to be even more salient in the really large and powerful urban centers of the coasts. Similarly, if the social class of the community and the characteristics of the students, are the most important conditions shaping teachers' work even where principals are more active and successful than most and where staff relations are relatively good, these conditions must be significant across the board.

Our papers also benefit more than they suffer from our having studied eight schools relatively intensively, rather than studying a large sample with a survey, because our methods matched the kinds of questions we asked and the statements we made. We were not attempting to make descriptive statements about the covariation of particular variables across schools. Rather, we were looking at the way processes work in schools and the ways in which a range of influences interact in daily life. Furthermore, we were asking how teachers' experience their work and about the flow of the way they think and talk about it rather than about the frequency of their use of various tangible practices or their expression of particular opinions.

For such purposes, it is crucial for the researcher to have access to the give and take of daily life including classroom practice and spontaneous conversation

among all participants in the school. That we used methods that gave us such access allowed us to see teachers' work in an unusual perspective, that is both uncommon and crucially important to understanding teachers' motivations. This study was unusual among those addressing the nature of teachers' work lives by having a team of researchers participate in the schools where the teachers we studied worked for more than two weeks. We learned about their experience of work by watching it and by asking open-ended questions that allowed them to express their priorities, experiences, and feelings. The sixty-four teachers of our core sample, could respond to us in concrete, vivid terms because they were talking to interviewers who had just seen them teach for a day and who were acquainted with their administrators and many of their colleagues. Many of the other teachers whom we interviewed more briefly and yet others with whom we had informal conversations could refer to one or more classes we had recently seen. We could let the teachers define the important dimensions of their work for us; we did not have to piece them together from patterns of answers to questions that might be differentially understood in different contexts. Furthermore, the study was, I believe, unique in the fact that a single team of researchers spent a whole year in consecutive study of eight schools, using identical methods in each.[2]

SOME ADDITIONAL FINDINGS FROM THE STUDY

It is important to acknowledge that the whole round of life in high schools, not only the experience of going to high school, but that of teaching in high school, varies with social class. Since we started our writing about the schools at the outside with their overall features and proceeded inward only as far as we had time for, in the papers of this report we had only a limited opportunity to discuss some of the organizational features that most of the reform literature sees as possibly manipulable in order to produce radical change in high schools. In the schools we saw the social class of the community played an important role in shaping at least two of these organizational features, teachers' opportunities for collegiality and participation in governance and the role of the principal.

First, it was striking, and we thought no accident, that the three highest SES schools, Cherry Glen, Maple Heights, and St. Augustine's, had different social structures for teachers from the other schools. They moved in the directions supported by the second wave of reform. Teachers had an extra hour for preparation. They had both more opportunity and more pressure to engage in collegial consultation. They had more financial and social support for participation in professional activities and associations outside the school (especially at the public schools). They had more say in faculty governance and school or district policy (especially at Maple Heights and St. Augustine's). Department chairs had more formal and informal power as instructional leaders, or there were informal faculty leaders who set examples for others. Teachers had a sense that others knew and cared what they taught.

At the schools in working or lower class communities, all of these conditions were absent or less marked. Since these are the conditions very like those most often recommended in the second wave of reform, it is important to note that they seem to grow up naturally where parents are well-educated and students

skilled and eager to learn, while they are scarce and hard to establish in the absence of those conditions.

The discouragement that teachers' felt in the working and lower class schools and their alienation from students seem important in creating the lack of collegial consultation. It is noteworthy here that the Pinehill women created much more collegiality than did the Pinehill men, and that they experienced the students as more teachable, and so made them more teachable. Similarly, there were collegial pockets elsewhere, for example in the science department at Quincy and the English department at Drew. In these pockets the teachers shared a vision of what they wanted to do with students and either created or persuaded themselves they created at least limited success in doing it. It seems very likely that a sense of success in teaching creates a willingness to talk about one's teaching activities with others, while a sense of failure makes one retreat in a defensive way (cf. Rosenholtz, 1985). Still, those collegial consultations may help to create the success that sustains them. There may be circular processes here that can be moved from a downward to an upward spiral (cf. Metz, 1986).

At most of the schools we studied the principals were important figures with considerable effects on the schools. They worked hard at instilling positive values as they saw them and at encouraging teachers with what they thought were good ideas. But as one of the principals told us more or less directly, principals had to work within the value premises of their communities. In our team debriefing sessions, one way that we compared schools consisted in transplanting principals and successful teachers from one school to another in our imaginations. We found that imaginatively placing some highly effective principals in different schools led to tremendous disjunctions of style and substance between the "new" principal and the staff, students, and community. Such a move surely would have cast these "effective" principals adrift. They were as adept as they were because they knew how to operate within the parameters of the kinds of communities where they had had experience.

Nonetheless, the principals clearly did have an effect on the lives of teachers in these schools. Several kept at bay or in check a set of potentially highly disruptive, centrifugal forces in the school setting with significant implications for teachers' lives and work. One differed in passing such forces along to the school staff almost unmodified, even in some respects intensified, also with significant effects on the teachers.

Limits to the Effects of Social Class

Up to this point I have been arguing that social class matters and shapes most of the other characteristics of a school. Still, social class is by no means all of the story. In covering the most important overall influences on teachers our papers already present complex analyses, each in a short compass. We have not dealt systematically with differences between communities close in social class. These were marked and important. Maple Heights, with lower income but higher education and more professionals than Cherry Glen, fostered a more patrician, less striving consciousness. It also fostered a more critical and appreciative, less technical and instrumental, definition of knowledge. The fact that it was a smaller, more cohesive and homogeneous community, where teachers often lived and

felt similar to residents also made it different from the larger more diverse Cherry Glen where almost no teachers were residents.

Drew and Grant also were different. Grant not only drew on a furtherflung, more socially and racially diverse and less economically depressed set of neighborhoods, its students' skills were considerably stronger. These schools might both draw on lower SES neighborhoods, but Drew's was palpably more depressed. Between these schools, however, the strongest contrast stemmed from their internal lives, from the actions of their staffs. Drew's staff considerably improved conditions within the school from what they might have been, even though there were plenty of problems left to solve. Grant's staff seemed much less insightful and skilled in working with their community, central office, and students. Their problems seemed more severe than Drew's in some respects, even though the community and the characteristics of the students created less severe difficulties.

That social class has a tremendous impact on schools, making overwhelming differences between them, does not mean that staffs of schools can not shape what happens inside the schools so that they will differ significantly—even though schools with student bodies that differ significantly in social class are unlikely to resemble one another very closely. Of course, if one measures schools only by scores on standardized tests, schools that differ in social class can come to resemble each other much more easily than if one compares the quality of relationships in their daily round or the kind of classroom discourse that is common.

Furthermore, individual teachers can transcend their school settings to some extent. At every school there were individual teachers who were both dedicated and more successful than their colleagues, at least in creating better attendance, attention, and good spirit in the classroom. Sometimes these teachers worked as isolates, sometimes they banded together, and in some schools they were the dominant majority. In the same way in every school there were individual teachers who could not develop constructive relationships with their classes.

The teachers who developed the most constructive relationships with students even in the face of a lack of social support from students or colleagues generally brought strong value systems related to their teaching into the school from their outside lives. Sometimes they were black teachers determined to help black children; often they were religious people dedicated to help society or individual children or both; sometimes their subject or its larger implications provided a larger meaning system, as in the case of an biologist connected with the environmental movement. Often these people had some kind of an actual or symbolic social support system outside the school.

One caveat is very important, given the heavy emphasis on the effects of social class in these papers. While its effects are significant, they are still in some ways less pervasive than one would be led to believe by the informal, unacknowledged conventional wisdom discussed in the paper on "The American High School'..." that affects parents decisions in buying houses. Although most of the students in the schools that sent most of their graduates to college were polite and cooperative and turned in adequate work most of the time, they were by no means always diligent or gifted scholars. Many would not have gone to college had their parents not insisted on it and their peers made them feel it was expected of them. Many

had to struggle to do the work expected of them at all well, and some were sullen or resistant in doing so, even if ultimately compliant to the teacher's power of the grade. That grades mattered to these students for a whole host of reasons from parental pressure and peer respect to their importance in a life script leading them toward rewarding jobs was perhaps the single greatest difference between these schools and the others that we visited.

In the same way, there were eager and able students at the schools where few students went to college, even at Drew, the school in the most depressed area. In some classes for upper classmen there teachers addressed open-ended questions to their classes and students responded with what we thought were thoughtful answers. Some also scored well. At Grant, there were more such students, enough to compose a top track in some subjects with a fairly rigorous curriculum.

There were also differences within schools that parallel those between schools, at least as far as the impact of students on teachers was concerned. We heard some teachers at the high SES schools talking in negative terms about students in classes for low achievers in much the way that teachers at the blue collar and low SES students talked about their students more generally. Others spoke of them with less hostility, but still with considerable perplexity and self-doubt. In the same way, we encountered teachers at the middle SES schools working with high track students with the intensity and pleasure we saw at the high SES schools. There were more fragmentary opportunities of this kind for teachers at the low SES schools.

For teachers' immediate experience, students' skills and willingness to cooperate with the agenda the teacher sets are the most important conditions in a school. Still, the community, the principal, formal school structures, and other teachers create conditions that affect that relationship in visible or subtle ways.

The Impact of The Reform Movement and Public Discourse About Teaching on Teachers' Experience

If the schools were permeable to influences from their communities, they were also permeable to influences from the larger society. Teachers at all the schools we visited were aware of the recent spate of books about secondary education written with a reform agenda. They were also aware that much of this literature and much of continuing public discussion about the deficiencies of schools blames teachers. They also thought that the public was not well-informed about the realities of their work.

It is fitting to let the teachers have the last word in this descriptive part of our report. We concluded our long interviews with teachers by asking what they would say if given the opportunity to teach the public one thing about their jobs as teachers. Answers from some of the teachers we thought were most skilled and most dedicated convey the sense of underappreciation that was pervasive in these answers. Each seems to speak partly to his or her local community and partly to a larger context. Mr. Crosby, a black teacher at Drew in a poor part of The Metropolis said:

> The public has such a low esteem for teachers; they don't think too

much of teachers. I think they should be aware that there are a lot of good teachers around in this system. There are a lot of good teachers who really, really enjoy their work and feel they are doing something worthwhile. I think the public needs to know that, so when they make statements about teachers they think about the fact that there are good teachers around who are helping this world to continue as far as the students going beyond high school.

A math teacher at Pinehill, a blue collar suburb of The City, talked about the complexity of her work:

> Oh, I don't think they realize how difficult the job really is. Some people who have [children], like parents, don't realize how difficult it is to handle thirty students in a classroom. That's just handling, that's not even trying to teach them. I just don't think they are aware of the problems involved. "What do you do? You just teach!" They don't understand all this interaction with the students and the frustrations you might have, because of students not working or discipliine or a kid telling you to go jump in the lake. They just are not aware of that and it's too bad.
>
> This is not an easy job. This is a very difficult job. It's a very time consuming job. It's a very draining job. You have to give. When you are in front of a classroom, you have to really work to try to get them to all pay attention and do things. And you have to keep being enthused. And it's very, very tiring. I don't think that they are are aware of that part of it. Maybe they think we get too much money or something. They don't realize just how difficult it is.
>
> It's also very, very enjoyable. Otherwise we wouldn't be doing it.
>
> They think we have it easy. It may appear easy. Like a kid will say, "You get paid for this? This is so easy!" Oh, boy, if they only knew.

At St. Augustine's, Mr. Laufer, an energetic young man who taught science to academically weaker students in this mixed but mostly college going population said:

> How demanding it is. How on the spot you are. How you have to deal with multiple situations and you have to have multiple skills to do that. How you have to come with ten different ways to say the same thing before everybody gets it. Not lose the first person who got it by the time the last person gets it. That they realize that there's no way a teacher could work year round. Absolutely no way. They would be fried or burnt out.

At comfortable Maple Heights where there was the highest parental education in our sample of public schools and about ninety percent of students go to college, a veteran teacher considered exemplary by her peers and a model to emulate by younger teachers said:

That it's not easy. That there is a lot more that goes into teaching than just standing in front of the class. I read about some of the proposals that have been made to let non-trained people become teachers, just walk into the classroom and open a book and suddenly you are going to be a teacher. There probably are people who could do that [if some one showed them how on the job].

But I just have to laugh. Because it seems to me it's a twenty year task to become a good teacher. Trial and error. You have to have active input constantly.

I do not sleep on Sunday nights. I did not sleep last night at all. I rarely sleep on Sunday nights. I'm planning my lessons. I'm worried that they aren't going to come out well. I wake up in the middle of the night. Other nights, when I'm tired, then I can sleep, because I have been working all day and working late hours. And thinking about a lesson that I have.

So, it's not something that you just walk in and off the top of your head start doing things. It takes a lot more. I don't think they have any concept of that.

Also at Maple Heights, Mr. Peirce, a math teacher, said:

The commitment that goes beyond time. The emotional commitment. Mental commitment. At times physical commitment. Showing kids things. It's just you give everything you've got. I don't think the public realizes teaching is that demanding. I mean if they realized how much we put in, they could realize why we go home really exhausted.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

High schools inescapably show the effects of the community, of the larger social stratification system of the society, and of entering students' skills, attitudes, and expectations developed over fourteen years in the community and schools for younger children. Consequently, one can not expect changes in the structure of individual schools alone to revolutionize the quality of experience that occurs within their walls. Change in the larger society will be required if we are to experience significant change in the schools. Short of such change, however, there are some steps that can be taken that could in varying measure alleviate some of the difficulties discussed in these papers.

Metropolitan Desegregation.

For metropolitan areas that take seriously the need to improve their schools and to prepare all their young people for productive participation as economic producers and as citizens, metropolitan desegregation may be the best policy remedy.

Reorganization of schools so that all are diverse not only in race but also in class could equalize the status of schools—or at least make it far more equal than it currently is. Teachers would no longer be stigmatized by working in schools in poor areas. In such a setting, it is important that all teachers carry a mixed load of students including those who adapt easily to the demands of mainstream schools and those who do not. Teachers should then be less likely to doubt their own capabilities or mentally to withdraw from teaching in response to working with unskilled or discouraged students.

In most communities there is fierce political resistance to metropolitan desegregation. Also schools with diverse student bodies present some organizational challenges to their staffs—though ones less serious than those posed by student bodies that are homogeneously poor in economic terms and low in skills. Still, desegregation orders and voluntary plans have created schools that are diverse in social class as well as race. While not all of those are models to be copied, many are (e.g. Lightfoot, 1983; Lipsitz, 1984; Metz, 1986). There is much practical wisdom in the best of these schools that school systems discouraged about their poorest schools might be wise to learn from both in designing individual schools and in reconsidering the implications of metropolitan desegregation.

Increased recognition for the nature and value of teachers' work.

The reward system in the educational community gives more respect and more tangible rewards to those who plan, advise, and coordinate than to those who actually teach. Though there is much that is beneficial in the second wave of reform, some parts of it seem designed to raise the status of teaching by having teachers teach less and plan or supervise more. Aides, volunteers, and visitors would work with children or children would be concentrated in larger groups with fewer teachers for at least part of the day. This view maintains the perspective that daily work face to face with students is of less value and significance than creating a grand design for students' efforts.

To persons who have spent a good deal of time in the schools, it is evident that, even for children as old as teenagers, personal contact helps to bring academic material alive and to bond them to it. With the poorest children with the weakest skills this contact is probably the most necessary. The quotations from our best teachers just given above suggest that connecting with the students, all of them, is a large part of the task as they see it. A good lesson is good only if they can get students actually to understand it. Many of the teachers we talked with had a strong sense of craft and a strong sense of dedication; they believed deeply in the significance of their contact with students.

The process of interchange and relationship between teacher and students is difficult to see and talk about because it consists in the slow accretion of personal trust, academic skills, and intellectual insight, not in anything that can be written up and produced as a product like a report, or plan for a program, or a new curriculum. But it is the basic stuff of learning and of teaching. It simply can not be replaced. If we care about the next generation and about the many teachers who willingly invest themselves in this process, persons who set the terms of discourse about education should honor, not denigrate, this mundane but crucial process.

Social appreciation is an important reward and support for all of us. While teachers do need better pay and some time away from students to plan and to refresh themselves with collegial contact, they also need public recognition and respect for their necessarily unspectacular participation in the daily exchange that cumulates to good teaching and effective learning.

Teachers' work does not seem important in the eyes of society in part because it is work with low status people, children. Teachers' status reflects the status of the people they work with. Reflected status is lowest for those who work not just with children, but with children who will never go to college and who may not finish high school, or with children who are from poor families and members of minority groups. But for students whose families are in depressed and depressing economic and social circumstances, teachers may offer their only hope of full economic, social, and political citizenship. If we want an adult citizenry who are economically self-sufficient and politically informed, we should consider the efforts of teachers who work with such children crucial to the social fabric. Teachers should receive the respect due to persons performing a socially critical function.

The remarkable ability of the leaders of the most recent federal administration to change the terms of discourse about education leads one to think that, especially in matters of cultural values, consciously designed public rhetoric has a notable effect. Reformers should bring to bear the resources of their impact on public discourse, the bully pulpit (Jung and Kirst, 1986), to improve public respect for the actual process of classroom teaching, for the importance of daily interaction between teachers and students. Similarly, national spokesmen should stress the esspecially important role for society of those teachers who work with the twenty-five percent of children growing up in poverty.

Alternatives to Real School

Some people commenting on the paper about "The American High School..." have asked for tangible alternatives to Real School or have queried whether any exist. There are none at work on a national scale. There is no second nationwide system, no loyal opposition to Real School. On the other hand, there has been a persistent, but never widely institutionalized, alternative set of educational ideas at work in this country that has roots as far back as the nineteenth century. Furthermore, there have been countless individual experiments at individual schools or in individual school systems for which success has been claimed.

As I acknowledge in the paper on "The American High School..." alternatives to the routines that have been dominant are risky, demanding, and against the bureaucratic and political grain. It may be best to introduce alternatives to Real School piecemeal, on a school by school basis or in small systems. Successful experiments can be copied and unsuccessful ones dropped. Schools and school systems can choose alternatives that fit the characteristics of their students, the politics of their districts, and the skills and energy levels of their teachers. Such changes, then, should be introduced in the context of decentralization.

Training in Biculturalism

Real School is based on assimilationist premises. Its form and content are based in middle class and bureaucratic assumptions. Formal and hidden curricula based on assimilation are viable if students think they will give them access to the mainstream. But an increasing number of students do not have that faith. As recent research comparing immigrants to native minority students has shown (Ogbu 1987), not only in the United States but in other countries as well (Woolard, forthcoming) immigrant students, who believe that assimilation will give them access to the mainstream, learn better in traditional schools than do native minority students, who are more skeptical that school will grant them access to mainstream opportunities and who have supportive social ties in communities outside the mainstream on which the embracing of assimilationist schooling will place strains.

Summing up a good deal of anthropological research on minority students resistance to school, Erickson (1987) argues that students must be able to trust their teachers if they are to engage themselves in learning. While there are many ways to develop such trust, it is most likely to occur if teachers find students home cultures legitimate, at least, or, at the very least, have empathy with the students as persons.

As Hemmings' paper argues most strongly, we saw teachers who could not see any legitimacy to the way of life of students' communities or to the way of life they were likely to adopt if they stayed in those communities. Since their judgements on the students' family and friends and their probable futures, were likely to be communicated directly or indirectly to students, teachers' rejection of the legitimacy of students' backgrounds became a major block to students' trust and a major source of a cycle of classroom conflict. Often these teachers had had little contact with students' communities and were operating on the basis of negative images from the popular media. We found that teachers who knew more about the communities generally were less condemning of them and considered their way of life less illegitimate, though not necessarily one to be chosen if a young person could muster the resources to avoid it.

In our data this issue was most vividly illustrated in the contrasting attitudes of some white and most black teachers toward black communities. Their descriptions as well as their valuing of these communities differed in some important respects. At the same time, some black teachers had had only limited exposure to mainstream white culture and so were not able to teach their students attitudes and some skills expected of students who had gone to mainstream schools. In short, whether white or black, teachers were more effective if they had extensive knowledge of and sympathy with both cultures. The same principle applied across classes, but because those lines were less easily visible and indeed were more blurred, the contrasts were less vivid. Also, the conflict over authority between male teachers of blue collar origin and blue collar students willing to give teachers only limited respect and obedience vitiated much of the rapport they might have developed—though some developed it in extracurricular settings where authority was less at issue.

In policy terms then it seems important that minority young people be encouraged to go into teaching. But capable young minority persons have many attractive alternatives. There will not be enough such new teachers to fill the

need. Both schools of education and school districts can and should work on creating biculturalism where it does not occur naturally.

There is a model for inducing biculturalism in middle class mainstream students in programs that church groups and the Peace Corps and Vista have sponsored. Teachers—the younger the better—need to be immersed in the communities their students come from. If groups undergoing such immersion can be composed of students or young teachers who themselves vary in background, so that discussion among program participants can assist in the process of interpretation, that would also be beneficial. It is difficult to run such programs in the context of the school where teachers may feel they have to keep their role as one who gives knowledge and instills morals. Programs should be established in the summers where teachers or teachers in training live in the community and work at something other than education so that they can work as much as possible side by side with community residents, not as superiors dispensing knowledge. Community members should meet with them and tell them about community history and interpret community perspectives and customs. For reciprocity, colleges can run summer programs for community high school students, while school districts may be able to hire some community leaders as consultants or in human relations positions.

Where universities or district consortia for inservice training are involved, the same group of teachers, or students in training to be teachers, could meet together during the year, to discuss history or literature that reflects both mainstream and minority perspectives. A dialogue can grow up that helps both majority group and minority group members understand and appreciate the others' point of view and its roots in each group's history and common experience. Such seminars will not be easy to run, as these topics are ones that carry much emotional freight on all sides. But with skilled leaders they can prevent much misunderstanding later and set a precedent for frank discussions of a kind we did not see where lines of race, class, or even of gender became divisive in our schools.

Endnotes

1. However, one should not romanticize the small town high school as a genuinely common school within the modern industrial order. Jeffrey Jacobson, who was on the staff of the field study of administrators, did his dissertation using project interview guides in two small towns more than fifty miles from The City. He found one dominated by middle class, college oriented families who often worked in The City or a smaller nearer city, while the other was dominated by families without college education who worked in blue collar industries in the town or in agriculture (Jacobson, 1988).

2. As principal investigator for the study of teachers, I was personally present in six, in three of them for more than the prescribed two and a half weeks, and the principal investigator for the administrative study, Richard Rossmiller, was personally present in all eight for nearly a week. After visiting each school, the whole group of visitors from the teacher study and the coordinated study of administrators held at least two long debriefing meetings at which we shared data and analysis about the school and made comparisons with the schools studied up to that time.

3. Rossmiller will deal in detail with principals' roles in his paper from the Field Study of Principals. Metz also deals with it in her paper in draft, "The Impact of Cultural Variation on High School Teaching," which deals with interacting influences in three schools.

REFERENCES

Erickson, Frederick. "Transformation and School Success: The Politics and Culture of Educational Achievement." Anthropology and Education Quarterly 18, no. 4 (1987): 335-356.

Jacobson, Jeffrey. Levers and Barriers Affecting Teacher Engagement: A Case Study of Two Small Secondary Schools. Unplublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Educational Administration, University of Wisconsin—Madison, 1988.

Jung, R. K. and Michael W. Kirst, "Beyond Mutual Adaptation in the Bully Pulpit: Recent Research on the Federal Role in Education," Educational Administration Quarterly 22 (September 1986): 80-109.

Lightfoot, Sara Lawrence. The Good High School: Portraits of Character and Culture. New York: Basic Books, 1983.

Lipsitz, Joan. Successful Schools for Young Adolescents. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books, 1984.

Metz, Mary Haywood. Different By Design: The Context and Character of Three Magnet Schools. New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1986.

Ogbu, John. "Variability in Minority School Performance: A Problem in Search of an Explanation." Anthropology and Education Quarterly 18, no. 4 (1987): 312-334.

Rosenholtz, Susan J. "Effective Schools: Interpreting the Evidence." American Journal of Education 93 no. 3 (1985): 352-387.

Woolard, Kathryn A. Double Talk: Bilingualism and the Politics of Ethnicity in Catalonia. Stanford CA: Stanford University Press, forthcoming.